Robinson Low

I am submitting comments WCA received from our member base regarding the SMA Preliminary Draft language proposed by Ecology.

Our members have tailored these comments individually so please accept these as separate, individual comments rather than one sign on comment.

Thank you.

August 15, 2025, 6:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Patricia S Coffey
drcoffey@whidbey.com

August 15, 2025, 6:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jilda Nettleton
jilda2bean@yahoo.com

August 15, 2025, 3:35 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Sandra Adams
adamssm5015@wavecable.com

August 15, 2025, 11:21 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Rebecca New Canright
rebeccagroovypeace@gmail.com

August 15, 2025, 10:30 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ef Mccormick
ejspressurecleaning@gmail.com

August 14, 2025, 9:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Elizabeth Bruce Riggs
eb.riggs@yahoo.com

August 14, 2025, 8:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marquam Krantz
marquamk@msn.com

August 14, 2025, 4:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mx. Morgan Brownlee
Morgbrownlee@gmail.com

August 14, 2025, 4:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Tamsen Benson
tamsen34@gmail.com

August 14, 2025, 3:53 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jackie Stewart
jackiestewart4@me.com

August 14, 2025, 2:39 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I am a citizen concerned about the management and health of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions. Thank you for this opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Vicky McCarley
Forestgelflin@aol.com

August 14, 2025, 11:43 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Asphodel Denning
asphodeldenning@hotmail.com

August 14, 2025, 4:02 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mariana Turrubiates Garcia
Mariana_itzel96@hotmail.com

August 14, 2025, 2:02 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Karen Boehler
karen_boehler@yahoo.com

August 14, 2025, 1:55 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Vanessa Jamison
msvanjam@outlook.com

August 13, 2025, 11:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity. Cannot count any more on any federal support, we have to protect the shoreline resources ourselves.

Sincerely,
Prof. William Alexander
b2alexa@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 11:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jollie Carlson
jolliec@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 11:00 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Greg Goodwin
anandashik7@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 9:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sharon Sollenberger
ssollenberger@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 8:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jayme Jonas
jaymejo1@msn.com

August 13, 2025, 8:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Mary Krohner
mekrohner@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 8:03 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Bates
james.bates3@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 6:12 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Carol A Cole
dickcarolcole@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 5:52 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Destini Robinson
destinirobinson1@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 4:50 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Angie Dixon
angied@whidbey.com

August 13, 2025, 4:44 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Shelly Vallem
shelval@outlook.com

August 13, 2025, 4:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dawn Kenyon
dmarie@nycap.rr.com

August 13, 2025, 4:13 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Habib
davidjhabib@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 4:09 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Alan Hardcastle
Alanhardcastle1@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 4:03 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ingrid Rochester
robandingrid@outlook.com

August 13, 2025, 3:58 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mel Ropke
gvngrn@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Janet Hurt
janethurt@icloud.com

August 13, 2025, 2:28 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Steven Yanoff
syanof@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 2:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. heidi Lynn ahlstrand
ironrancher@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 2:21 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Line Ringgaard
miss_bmw2007@hotmail.com

August 13, 2025, 1:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Dennis Ledden Sr
lcs5779@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 1:29 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Arnold D Strang
adstrang@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 1:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Gae Taylor
Taylortribe@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 11:41 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Deborah Efron
catsforme@hotmail.com

August 13, 2025, 7:11 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lori Erbs
lorieji@cs.com

August 13, 2025, 6:50 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Roger Schmidt
schmidtroger1000@hotmail.com

August 13, 2025, 6:25 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

Washington State established the Shoreline Management Act in 1971, due to flooding rivers from atmospheric rivers in mountainous area. In the past 5 years, a season of atmospheric torrential rainfall flooded many rivers, and rising sea level in shoreline of Washington state has become a major problem. Des Moines beaches (Rodondo)has been experiencing rising tide from the impact of climate change . Scientists has predicted that sea level could rise significantly in the coming decades, leading to increased coastal flooding, erosion, and saltwater intrusion. This will gravely impact the salmon journey and other marine communities in the Puget Sound. Washington Coastline is a very important, because the majority of salmon comes from Alaska, travel to Washington and California. Rajwantee Robinson Des Moines I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Rajwantee Robinson
rajwanteer@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 5:57 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynette Bech w bech
dbech@bellsouth.net

August 13, 2025, 5:56 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I want to urge you to strongly consider the points made below. As a citizen of WA State I can walk to our shoreline on the Salish Sea. Our parks, homes and businesses are located next to the sea We need to plan for the changes that will come as sea level rises alongvwith storm severity and the water will reclaim our infill and shorelines will change. Now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while

mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Judith Akins
Jakinsmbgsierracl@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 5:37 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Meridian Green
meridian@mcn.org

August 13, 2025, 5:33 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Bill Justis
justis6345@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 5:02 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara Fristoe
bfristoe@mac.com

August 13, 2025, 5:01 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Nancy P White
nancypendletonwhite@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 5:01 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lauren E Sewell
sewellauren@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 4:46 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mx. Michael J. Siptroth
flybill2@wavecable.com

August 13, 2025, 4:11 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

As a native Seattlite who spent much time on Puget Sound 75 years ago when it was much cleaner, I am concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is more important than ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as vital to retain in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support for them. Additionally, there are areas where I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language.

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county,

and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Linda L Carroll
lindalouise701184951@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 4:10 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Amy R Scott
theamyscott@hotmail.com

August 13, 2025, 4:08 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Stacie Charlebois
armostacie@hotmail.com

August 13, 2025, 4:05 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Emily Willoughby
emilya57@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 3:25 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Felicity Hohenshelt
Licy75@aol.com

August 13, 2025, 2:53 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Sally Allen
sallyjallen@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 2:49 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Cindy Arasim ☐¤ï¸☐
Indysay@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:41 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Craig A Swanson
cvcanda@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 2:39 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Desirae Golis
desirae.golis@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:36 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Rein A Attemann
Reinattemann@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 2:24 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jalair Przybycien
blue.przy@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:19 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jeffrey J Kaufman
jeff.kaufman1984@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:15 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Adam Maldonado
adamvmal@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:10 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity. Sue L Lepore

Sincerely,
Mrs. Sue Lepore
suelepore53@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 2:06 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function. I just read a book called "California Against the Sea" by Rosanna Xia. There are many lessons for any state with a coastline. Common language and common definitions help. Of course local municipalities will want to tailor responses to match local needs and conditions. But sea level rise affects more than a single town and coherence across the state (or the PNW) can only be a plus.

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This could benefit from further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. On the other hand, too much documentation can prove restrictive, and I like leaving what "affected Tribes" means open. It sounds good for local and statewide interests to have a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment completed. However, there may not be sufficient staffing or money or time to finish this paperwork, so I think there should be options to be included even if this is not submitted. I think we will see a losses of ecological function. Achieving net loss makes it seem like it is possible to trade a loss for a "win" somewhere else. This is false reasoning. Is it better to save parts of multiple ecosystems or entire whole ecosystems? We will have to choose what to prioritize. How these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced will be critical. Language stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** may be important. I am keen on advancing adaptation efforts ahead of rising sea levels and other threats related to climate change. Thank you for the draft Shoreline Management Act and the opportunity to provide comments on it.

Sincerely,
Shirley Huang
shriljh1919@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 2:04 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lisa A Harris
lisaharris2001@icloud.com

August 13, 2025, 1:53 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. David Dragon
joeofny73@netscape.com

August 13, 2025, 1:36 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Susan & Mr. Peter and Mr. Peter Risser
srisser@rockisland.com

August 13, 2025, 1:26 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Judith Smith
judithsmith313@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 1:16 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Peter F Reagel
preagel@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 1:08 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity. Sincerely, Sandy Covich Puyallup, Wa 98373

Sincerely,
Ms. Sandy Covich
slcovich@comcast.net

August 13, 2025, 1:07 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Lori Stefano
lorilstefano@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 1:05 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jill Dolan
jdquarterhorse363@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 12:58 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lisa Nemeth
lnemeth.eagles@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 12:47 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ananthi Rangarajan
ananthi.rangarajan@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 12:28 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Liana Lang
lianalang79@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 12:18 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shannon Dee Markley
markley.shannon@yahoo.com

August 13, 2025, 12:16 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Phoebe Bachleda
bachleda.phoebe@gmail.com

August 13, 2025, 12:08 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Andrea Chisari
chisaria@att.net

August 12, 2025, 11:48 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical and vulnerable shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Full, good faith Tribal consultation must be non-negotiable. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Karla Ward
kkward2432@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 11:42 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Emily Austin
Oceanminded09@proton.me

August 12, 2025, 11:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Scott SpeciesThis Species
sspecies@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 11:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Chelsea A A Norvell
catsrkool1992@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 11:35 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Michael W. Shurgot
mwshurgot@earthlink.net

August 12, 2025, 11:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Brandie Deal
laughsalot0579@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 11:29 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jean M Schwinberg
jeanschwinberg@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 11:10 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lydia garvey public health Garvey
wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 11:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Barbara Sanborn
sanbornbarbara@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 11:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Donna E Snow
dsnow3@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 11:01 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
David Wilson
wilsonillustration@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 10:56 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Selden Prentice
prenticeselden@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 10:49 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jeff Steitzer
jssteitzer@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 10:44 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Linda Martin
zzpaws33@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 10:42 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you representing Whidbey Audubon Society, an engaged group of nearly 500 individuals who prioritize healthy shorelines and environments who are concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. As part of Washington Conservation Action, we sign on to this letter. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while

mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Joaquin Swett
director@whidbeyaudubonsociety.org

August 12, 2025, 10:34 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jean E Spohn
jeanspohn@centurylink.net

August 12, 2025, 10:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Estelle Thyer
ethyer@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 10:31 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jean E Spohn
jeanspohn@centurylink.net

August 12, 2025, 10:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lee Musgrave
lee@leemusgrave.com

August 12, 2025, 10:29 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Darcy Skarada
dskarada@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 10:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I am a Washington state citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, we must ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and people alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other

important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. This rulemaking has the potential to ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Cindy Brown
browncindyd@outlook.com

August 12, 2025, 10:17 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jennifer MacDonald
macd2333@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 10:13 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kevin K Walsh
walshkevink@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 10:12 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kevin K Walsh
walshkevink@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 10:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Barbara C Scavezze
barb@scavezze.com

August 12, 2025, 10:03 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marquam Krantz
marquamk@msn.com

August 12, 2025, 10:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I want my son to inherit a livable planet, and with that in mind I want to make sure our local jurisdictions along the water are planning for the coming increases in storms, severity, and sea levels. I understand the is a rulemaking currently started for the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). Please work to make sure this rulemaking incorporates strong language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function. It is also my understanding that a preliminary draft has many strong points (good things to keep). Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses

language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions. I hope you'll take these comments into consideration as you look at each one of those sections as the rulemaking proceeds forward. Please think of our future generations as you use the SMA to ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brandon Bowersox-Johnson
brandonbowersox@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 9:39 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shary B
shary50@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 9:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Beth Sara Call
trollshouse@bmi.net

August 12, 2025, 9:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Vicki Thomas
fogchaser76@duck.com

August 12, 2025, 9:21 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jean Marie Pauley
jeanlunnemann@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 9:21 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Frey
markfreyphoto@ywave.com

August 12, 2025, 9:20 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Sheri Dotson Dotson Parker
sharsparrs@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 9:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. mary e. Elizabeth H. zimmerman
melihandy@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 9:07 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Margaret Woll
marjean23@aol.com

August 12, 2025, 8:54 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynn E Lichtenberg
mimlichtenberg@frontier.com

August 12, 2025, 8:53 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
CDR Jim and Nancy and Nancy Roberts
nanjim70@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 8:48 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Judy Hallisey
hydrojude@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:41 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,
Joan Zierler
kahblue@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:41 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Elizabeth Sheinkopf
esheinkopf@mac.com

August 12, 2025, 8:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Patricia Genetically Dion
pbdion06@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 8:34 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ernie Walters
ernwalt@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 8:34 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Hollinrake
markhollinrake1993@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Valentine
faboo1028@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:20 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions. I have been a volunteer for Stream Stewards and Lacamas Watershed Council collectively for 10 years now and I advocate for healthy streams. We need to keep all waterways GREEN and natural to keep water temperatures down and nurture the plants and animals that filter our air and water, not to mention have just as much right to be there as we do. If you can't see the morality of protecting these waterways, then look at the health issue, and if that doesn't impress you, consider the health and mental health costs of unfiltered water, air and soil, and lack of green spaces for people to "decompress" from the increasingly chaotic world. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Suzan K Heglin
windsof2@aol.com

August 12, 2025, 8:19 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Anah McMahon
Anahmc@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 8:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Florie Rothenberg
frothenberg@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 8:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mark Rohde
markrohdephd@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Heather Momyer
heathermomyer@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Gary Albright
galbright68@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 8:01 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Emily Geballe
egeballe@hotmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:59 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara Brock
wbbrock@wavecable.com

August 12, 2025, 7:58 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Meredith Shank
meredith@womenforsustainableworld.org

August 12, 2025, 7:57 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Annie McCann
gem3@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 7:46 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Caitlin Birkholz
birkholz.caitlin@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:41 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. James S Mulcare
JSMulcare52@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. A Hamilton
hamilton.aimee@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Jamie Shields
jfillmore66@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kate Majestic
katdelioncourt@hotmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

Hello, thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SMA. In the context of the current political federal administration's weakening of environmental laws and policies, it is imperative that DOE keep our Shoreline Management Programs strong and bold. We in Washington have always, and will continue to cherish, our healthy shorelines and it is critical that DOE and its leadership continue respecting and administering the SMA in ways that uphold the values of constituents. To that end, please see my comments below in several areas:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language must direct local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181. That said, Ecology must specifically define these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret information. It also creates better consistency in how these areas are managed. Also, Ecology must be more specific in their language around "affected Tribes". Local jurisdictions should not define what "affected Tribes" means. Finally, local jurisdictions must complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment. This assessment must also depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: DOE must hold to the strong language added around "No Net Loss" of ecological function. Also, I support the new language regarding the expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions. Throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology should add language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". These additions serves an important reminder that the "No Net Loss" value system is being recognized and acted upon throughout the programs.

Effective enforcement and compliance: DOE must be extremely clear in these documents how SMA regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced. To this end: 1) DOE should add a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state. 2) DOE should add a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity AND the cost of restoring the affected area. 3) The order for removal and remediation also be clearly stated as applicable to unpermitted structures. 4) DOE should retain the provision about citizen or civil suits in this section to hold violators accountable at the local AND state level. 4) DOE should gather information from local jurisdictions on any exemptions and substantial development permits -
this will be important for public transparency and accountability. DOE should commit to publishing this information online (in an accessible format) to more readily track and enforce "No Net Loss" of ecological functions. I encourage this information to be translated into the key languages used throughout the state, as identified through the HEAL Act. Thank you for

incorporating these comments into your final version. Please do not hesitate to reach out if you have any questions about my comments.

Sincerely,
Christina Billingsley
christinabillingsley@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:34 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Victoria Urias
vickiurias@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 7:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Karen Paul
jami_son@hotmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:27 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Deborah Kaye
deborahwkaye@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:27 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Marie Marie Marrs
marie.heroncove@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:27 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Allen Gibbs
agibbspr@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Marilee Henry
marilee@henrythorson.com

August 12, 2025, 7:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Nancy Johnson
jargent6986@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Hannah Taylor
hannaht326@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Gary Gill
gsquared999@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:17 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ellen Pifer
Ellen.pifer1@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:17 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Kathy sugarman
kathysugarman@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Prof. Kathleen A OConnell
koconne@iupui.edu

August 12, 2025, 7:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Yvette Goot
Yvetteolsen@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 7:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynn Graham
Animalwelfare77@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 7:10 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Evelyn Scolman Lemoine
elemoine@seanet.com

August 12, 2025, 7:09 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Maureen O'Neal
momoneal77@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:09 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Henling
dhenling@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:09 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Laura J Ray
oolalava@verizon.net

August 12, 2025, 7:09 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Caroline SÃ©villa
caronyna@msn.com

August 12, 2025, 7:07 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Stephen J. Rosenman
sjr91@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 7:07 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Kensler
Kensler-Prager
kkensler@msn.com

August 12, 2025, 7:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Max Prinsen
Max@shadowhabitat.org

August 12, 2025, 7:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Adam Leveen
larryleveen@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 7:03 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barclay Hauber
barclay.hauber@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:59 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Peter Bahls
peter@nwwatershed.org

August 12, 2025, 6:58 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kristin Fitzpatrick
kristfitz@live.com

August 12, 2025, 6:57 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Hiedi Tan
Bugdoc012000@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:54 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Louise Stonington
lstoning@msn.com

August 12, 2025, 6:54 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Wister Miller
grover302@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:52 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Linda Whipple
Lbwhiple@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:49 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

Protect critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, it is as important as ever to ensure that this rulemaking incorporates strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other

important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clayton M Compton
claycompton@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 6:49 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as someone who is concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. Given that climate change will undoubtedly bring sea level rise, it is critical that advance planning be done to protect our Washington Coastline. I am particularly concerned about the lack of remediation at the toxic Rainier Mill site in Port Angeles. This has been an issue for almost 30 years now and, if not addressed, could present an even more serious problem with the environment given sea level changes. I encourage you to develop a comprehensive plan that addresses all these issues related to shoreline management.

Sincerely,
Stephanie Sherman
stephaniemowa@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:47 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Charles Creed
charlescreed724@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:40 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Joanne Swanson
swansonjoanne04@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Robert T Schmelter
laserbob2k@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

Thank you for the opportunity to make a comment on how local governments should plan for sea level rise and increased storm severity under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). I live in Vancouver, Washington, and have been actively involved in volunteer work for the past five years or so, to try to save our salmon and our Southern Resident orcas. The orcas are almost extinct because of a lack of chinook salmon, and our shorelines act as nurseries for young salmon. The more I learn about these issues, the more I understand that all of nature is connected to everything else in nature. And it has also become clear to me that if nature is not functioning, people cannot survive. Managing our shorelines effectively, maintaining their ecological health, is critical to our own survival. For any who deny climate change: With the Cascadia Subduction Zone off our shore, we must keep in mind that when the next 9.0 earthquake hits the Zone (some believe it is already overdue), our coastline will likely drop five feet or more. So while sea level rise due to climate change is somewhat gradual (assuming there is no sudden catastrophic collapse of ice sheets in the north and south), the likely chance of a sudden sea level "rise" (ie our coastline dropping several feet) from a Cascadia Subduction Zone earthquake is a guarantee, making our shoreline plans preparing for sea level rise all the more important. The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring

masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Marjorie Millner
mmillner2@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
James Cavallaro
jimcava55@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:35 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Eric G Holtz
eholtz716@hotmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:34 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Halleli Schauble
halleli.zacher@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:33 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gary Beckerman
rocksnfr@comcast.net

August 12, 2025, 6:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

Please ensure that this rulemaking achieves no net loss of ecological function, under changing climate conditions. Be aware that we are on a path to 3dC of global warming AND that there is now evidence that current projections may be based on optimistic climate sensitivity assumptions. In planning, consider worst case sea level rise, including space for likely paths of retreat of natural systems inland. I agree with the following message, which summarizes important considerations: The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses

language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Donna Albert
donna.albert@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:29 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Judith Anderson
jskanderson@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel AND LYS Brant
dnlbrant@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Matt Schierholtz
mpschier1@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Margaret McDonald
meg.mcdonald5@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Rev. Gregory William William Peters
Msandrev@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:22 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

As a prior owner of Washington shoreline property, I urge you to support these concerns by Washington Conservation. Shoreline conservation plays a vital role downstream. Thank you. I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while

mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Craig Wentzel-Siva
crws.mobile@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:21 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Nicole Fountain
nicmasterflash@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:21 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Sharon L Bersaas
bersaas@aol.com

August 12, 2025, 6:19 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Mary Jo Jo Butler
rbmjbeb@aol.com

August 12, 2025, 6:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike W Abler
mabler@sbcglobal.net

August 12, 2025, 6:17 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Terry Nightingale
tnight@pobox.com

August 12, 2025, 6:16 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara A. Harper
jandbharper@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Margaret Woll
marjean23@aol.com

August 12, 2025, 6:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Joanne Joanne Watchie
jwatchie@sbcglobal.net

August 12, 2025, 6:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mx. Nancy Hauer
nancy@rookhouse.org

August 12, 2025, 6:13 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Timothy Edward Edward Duda
timduda@aol.com

August 12, 2025, 6:13 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Abi Loihl
loihl.abi@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:12 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Mechthild Rast
mera577@mac.com

August 12, 2025, 6:12 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Norm Conrad
nsconrad@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Janna d Rolland
jannarolland@hotmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Terry Tedesco
ttedesco49@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mark Reback
Markreback@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynn Hoang
spacecadetnova_2000@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Keith P D'Alessandro
keith_dalessandro@outlook.com

August 12, 2025, 6:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Megan Pursell
trvlgrrl@hotmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:07 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Cole Kanaka Koa Mumper
androcidious11@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:07 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Lloyd Johnston
lajceoigthi@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 6:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Alena Jorgensen
aj.1156@yahoo.com

August 12, 2025, 6:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jared and Whitney Howe
jaredchowe@gmail.com

August 12, 2025, 5:24 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Cheri Olney
Cheri.olney@whidbey.com

August 11, 2025, 8:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
David Cauffman
dave@cauffman.net

August 10, 2025, 8:53 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Susan Rogers Bond
susanrogersberg@gmail.com

August 9, 2025, 8:13 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Margaret M
margaretmo@harbornet.com

August 9, 2025, 5:58 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Gregory Denton
greg.denton@gmail.com

August 9, 2025, 2:13 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jane Erickson
janeyerickson@yahoo.com

August 8, 2025, 11:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lydia garvey public health Garvey
wolfhowlmama@yahoo.com

August 8, 2025, 11:13 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ryan Roberts
rc.roberts@live.com

August 8, 2025, 10:55 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Virginia Alexander
virginiaalexander16@yahoo.com

August 8, 2025, 10:06 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Lucas
slucas78704@gmail.com

August 8, 2025, 10:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Lucas
slucas78704@gmail.com

August 8, 2025, 12:13 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:The current language, "all reasonable and appropriate uses", leaves decisions open to bias and should be more clearly defined.

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county,

and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions. There are products available for shoreline land owners, already being used in states like Florida, and they should be presented as temporary solutions, for the short term sea level rise we are experiencing. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Gerald A Hill
jhill@whidbeyisland.com

August 7, 2025, 8:00 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity. Sincerely, Susan Rogers Bond

Sincerely,
Susan Rogers Bond
susanrogersberg@gmail.com

August 6, 2025, 9:13 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara Brock
wbbrock@wavecable.com

August 6, 2025, 9:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Sandra Vetra
sjvetra@hotmail.com

August 6, 2025, 8:53 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity. Mary C. Erickson

Sincerely,
Mary Erickson
marycerickson@gmail.com

August 6, 2025, 7:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Nia Martin
nia.m.martin@gmail.com

August 6, 2025, 6:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Paula Beth Shafransky
pshafransky@gmail.com

August 6, 2025, 3:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Judith Anderson
jskanderson@gmail.com

August 6, 2025, 2:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Val Schroeder
Hightide@wavecable.com

August 6, 2025, 2:17 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dave Felice
gelato321@aol.com

August 6, 2025, 3:20 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Larry Franks
Larry.fish.franks@gmail.com

August 6, 2025, 1:36 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Giles Sydnor
gsydnor@uw.edu

August 6, 2025, 1:35 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Tracy M Wang
tracyandgiles@gmail.com

August 5, 2025, 6:31 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Amanda Bullis
engage@whidbeyenvironment.org

August 5, 2025, 3:41 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Sarah Sterling
s.sterlingbird@gmail.com

August 5, 2025, 3:27 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Stacie Charlebois
armostacie@hotmail.com

August 5, 2025, 2:35 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jill Dolan
jdquarterhorse363@gmail.com

August 5, 2025, 1:00 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shary B
shary50@yahoo.com

August 5, 2025, 12:40 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Colleen K
dudette53147@yahoo.com

August 5, 2025, 12:32 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Kevin K Walsh
walshkevink@yahoo.com

August 5, 2025, 12:00 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lauren Stephanie Murdock
murdock_ls@hotmail.com

August 4, 2025, 10:01 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. James S Mulcare
JSMulcare52@gmail.com

August 4, 2025, 9:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Valentine
faboo1028@gmail.com

August 4, 2025, 8:10 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Vanessa Jamison
msvanjam@outlook.com

August 4, 2025, 6:24 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara A. Harper
jandbharper@yahoo.com

August 4, 2025, 6:19 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Julian Santos
julian@waconservationaction.org

August 4, 2025, 6:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Patti J Rader
pjrader@aol.com

August 4, 2025, 5:53 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Judith Anderson
jskanderson@gmail.com

August 4, 2025, 5:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Barbara C Scavezze
barb@scavezze.com

August 4, 2025, 4:45 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Gloria Ann McClintock
Gammerglo@aol.com

August 4, 2025, 4:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marquam Krantz
marquamk@msn.com

August 4, 2025, 4:31 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barclay Hauber
barclay.hauber@gmail.com

August 4, 2025, 1:39 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Uwe Dotzauer
uwe007@hotmail.com

August 3, 2025, 5:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard I Stern
rsisyh@yahoo.com

August 3, 2025, 1:09 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shary B
shary50@yahoo.com

August 2, 2025, 8:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Michael W. Shurgot
mwshurgot@earthlink.net

August 2, 2025, 7:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Shelly Vallem
shelval@outlook.com

August 2, 2025, 6:58 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Evelyn Bittner
evelynbittner@comcast.net

August 2, 2025, 4:32 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Miss Jadie Hwang
Lunaheart1@icloud.com

August 1, 2025, 7:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Wally L Bubelis
wbubelis@gmail.com

August 1, 2025, 4:35 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dawn Kenyon
dmarie@nycap.rr.com

August 1, 2025, 3:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Anne Sherwood
annegisele@outlook.com

August 1, 2025, 6:17 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Roger Schmidt
schmidtroger1000@hotmail.com

August 1, 2025, 2:06 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Florie Rothenberg
frothenberg@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 11:22 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

At this point in the Earth's history, we need to change our human actions. Regardless of how you feel about climate change, humans are polluting too much. There are too many of us and we are beginning to overload the planets natural systems. write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while

mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Cynthia J Lachance
clachance33@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 7:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Karen Boehler
karen_boehler@yahoo.com

July 31, 2025, 7:26 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Peter Bahls
peter@nwwatershed.org

July 31, 2025, 6:56 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Prof. Kathleen A OConnell
koconne@iupui.edu

July 31, 2025, 6:27 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function, as follows -
Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas, a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181. I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: This is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators

to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynette Weick
laweick@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 6:01 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Rita Hogan
canineherbalist@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 5:45 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Cami Miceli
crmpizza73@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 4:51 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Denise Bunge
luxembrg@bright.net

July 31, 2025, 4:40 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Eric Ross
ecross72@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 4:24 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kim Kensler
Kensler-Prager
kkensler@msn.com

July 31, 2025, 2:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Susan Shouse
sshouse64@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 2:03 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Kate Lunceford
kurlykate888@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Kimberly Detrick
kimd6878@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 1:27 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Karen Paul
jami_son@hotmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Kaia Hayes
Hayes.kaia.d@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:01 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Sego Jackson
pond@whidbey.com

July 31, 2025, 8:09 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lisa Nemeth
lnemeth.eagles@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 7:22 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Ellen J Atkinson
jeanne184490@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 6:50 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lori Erbs
lorieji@cs.com

July 31, 2025, 5:44 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Shannon Marie Milhaupt
smmilhau@yahoo.com

July 31, 2025, 5:37 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Nancy P White
nancypendletonwhite@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 3:25 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Lynn Hoang
spacecadetnova_2000@yahoo.com

July 31, 2025, 3:13 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Vanessa Jamison
msvanjam@outlook.com

July 31, 2025, 2:56 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel Henling
dhenling@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 2:53 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Chelsea A A Norvell
catsrkool1992@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 2:52 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Emily Willoughby
emilya57@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 2:50 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Andrea Avni
andrea.avni@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 2:48 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Maureen O'Neal
momoneal77@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 2:42 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Stacie Charlebois
armostacie@hotmail.com

July 31, 2025, 2:24 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Marianne Nelson
Manelson316@yahoo.com

July 31, 2025, 1:56 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Allison Phares
aap2uw@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:44 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. James Bates
james.bates3@comcast.net

July 31, 2025, 1:33 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Tracy Ouellette
tracyjouellette@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:32 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Tracy Ouellette
tracyjouellette@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:30 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Diana Jung
pmdiana7@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 1:06 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Selden Prentice
prenticeselden@gmail.com

July 31, 2025, 12:30 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jean Marie Pauley
jeanlunnemann@yahoo.com

July 31, 2025, 12:12 AM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Milo Rusnak
milo.m.rusnak@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 11:57 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Deborah Kaye
deborahwkaye@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 11:06 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Andrea Chisari
chisaria@att.net

July 30, 2025, 11:06 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Ingrid Rochester
robandingrid@outlook.com

July 30, 2025, 10:58 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Ed A Chadd
edchadd@olypen.com

July 30, 2025, 10:46 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Frey
markfreyphoto@ywave.com

July 30, 2025, 10:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve Shapiro
shapirosm@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 10:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Omar Siddique
omars1234@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 10:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Andrew Jackson
pamryans25@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 10:32 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function. A major problem that I see that needs correction by the legislature is that developers are allowed to build in the Shoreline Management zone under existing regulations when they first apply. Even as Comprehensive and Shoreline plans are in the process of being updated for climate change and sea level rise, developers can build into areas that will be the buffer zone or even below sea level in 20-30 years. We must have statewide regulation to require adjustment of requirements, such as vegetation buffers, for FUTURE sea level not current sea level.

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county,

and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Timothy S. Leadingham
freelance.finance.bytim@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 9:29 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Liisa Kellems
Liisa_antilla@hotmail.com

July 30, 2025, 9:24 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Dr. Robin M Lorentzen
robinlorentzen@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 9:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Elizabeth A Kennedy
Elizabeth.Kennedy@bastyr.edu

July 30, 2025, 8:38 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. elyette Marla weinstein
elyette_w@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 8:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Steve J Williams
prospect2125@aol.com

July 30, 2025, 8:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Jamie Shields
jfillmore66@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 8:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Joan Golden
joanuzelak@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 8:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Hannah Taylor
hannaht326@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 8:20 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Valentine
faboo1028@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 8:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Norman Dick
Normdick@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 8:06 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Tracey Leigh Bonner
tlb8@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 7:56 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. A Hamilton
hamilton.aimee@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:53 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Tiffany Dodge
tiff@hedgendary.com

July 30, 2025, 7:52 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. James R R Monroe
randy@monroescienceed.com

July 30, 2025, 7:46 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Yoan May
embracingease@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:41 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Cole Provence
cole.provence@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:40 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Linda Ellsworth
lindaellsworth51@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Jody Caicco
Jodycaicco@icloud.com

July 30, 2025, 7:36 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Brett M. Johnson
bmjohnson75@hotmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:33 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Brandie Deal
laughsalot0579@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 7:22 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Virginia Mendez
virginialefay@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:22 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Susan & Mr. Peter and Mr. Peter Risser
srisser@rockisland.com

July 30, 2025, 7:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Destini Robinson
destinirobinson1@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 7:14 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jennifer MacDonald
macd2333@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:55 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ernie Walters
ernwalt@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 6:55 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Denise Farrer
neese68@hotmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:54 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Urmila Padmanabhan
urmila26@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 6:49 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. April Woods
ms.april.woods@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Leslie A Kreher
leslie.kowitz@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Victor Escobar
sydbarrett74@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:18 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Daniel AND LYS Brant
dnlbrant@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Clayton M Compton
claycompton@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 6:10 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Elena Rumiantseva
cofica24@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 6:08 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Matt Hohensee
mrhohensee@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:06 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Lauren Flottorp
laurenflottorp@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 6:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mike W Abler
mabler@sbcglobal.net

July 30, 2025, 5:59 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Michael Joseph Rynes
discubs697@hotmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:58 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barclay Hauber
barclay.hauber@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:57 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Alena Jorgensen
aj.1156@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:57 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Richard Grout
grout@rockisland.com

July 30, 2025, 5:54 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Patrick Conn
Nvr2L82ConntactMe@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 5:51 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Alfred Ferraris
acferr@wavecable.com

July 30, 2025, 5:50 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Patricia Anne Rossi
circus_cyaneus@verizon.net

July 30, 2025, 5:48 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

Please do what you can to protect the shorelines. I know there are a lot of competing priorities and that some things feel useless, but at least try. I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county,

and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Dawn Marie Marie Pares
kormantic@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:47 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Noah Ehler
nehler957@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:37 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. Extensive research around the world demonstrates the use of dynamic revetements that work with not against nature are superior to alternatives. They are performing effectively in Westport Wa and South Beach. Working in concert with nature is vital. Please include language to incentivize research and the use of dynamic revetements in critical areas across Washinton state. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act.

Sincerely,
Sherri Fuller
slsfuller@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:34 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Sandra Gehri Bergman
s.gehri-bergman@outlook.com

July 30, 2025, 5:31 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen of an island in the Salish Sea (Vashon) and I am concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. A Dulfer
Amdulfer@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:30 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Wister Miller
grover302@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:29 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. James S Mulcare
JSMulcare52@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:25 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Mark Hollinrake
markhollinrake1993@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:23 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mrs. Bridgett Heinly
Kbmdogs@att.net

July 30, 2025, 5:19 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Victoria Urias
vickiurias@comcast.net

July 30, 2025, 5:17 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Agnes Reizik
agnes4democracy@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:15 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Line Ringgaard
miss_bmw2007@hotmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:12 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Llll D
Msldill@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:11 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Paulina Chalmers
Paulina.chalmers@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:10 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. heidi Lynn ahlstrand
ironrancher@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:07 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Ms. Barbara A. Harper
jandbharper@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:06 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Marquam Krantz
marquamk@msn.com

July 30, 2025, 5:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Virginia Alexander
virginiaalexander16@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:05 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mx. Sharon K Anderson
hadaverde@yahoo.com

July 30, 2025, 5:04 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Chiara Rose
chiaraloveswater@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:03 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Halleli Schauble
halleli.zacher@gmail.com

July 30, 2025, 5:02 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. John e Dunkum
dunkum@bresnan.net

July 30, 2025, 5:01 PM

Dear Rebecca Rothwell, Misty Blair, and Charlotte Dohrn,

I write to you as a citizen concerned about the management of Washington State's shorelines. In the face of a changing climate that will bring sea level rise and an increase in storm severity, now it is as important as ever to ensure the protection of critical shoreline habitats that support species and humans alike. This rulemaking must incorporate strong, clear language directing local jurisdictions to plan for and manage their shorelines to ensure we are achieving no net loss of ecological function.

The preliminary draft language has many strong points which I see as pivotal to keep in the final language. Some groups may push back against this strong language, so I want to identify those areas and voice my strong support. Additionally, there are areas I would like to see more clarity and strength in the language:

Sea level rise and increased storm severity: New language directs local governments and municipalities to define Sea Level Rise Hazard Areas, Future Tidal and Groundwater Inundation Areas, and Frequently Flooded Areas. This is a fundamental step in meeting the requirements of HB 1181 and I strongly support this directive in the new SMA language. However, local governments and municipalities would benefit from Ecology further defining these areas so there is less variability in how local jurisdictions interpret and more consistency in how these areas are managed across jurisdictional lines. Another area needing more definitions is how local jurisdictions define and engage with "affected Tribes". I appreciate the added language around communicating and engaging with affected Tribes and overburdened communities, but allowing local jurisdictions define what "affected Tribes" means leaves too much variance**. Any actions that impact Treaty Protected Resources, including the provisioning of salmon, impact Tribes** and therefore should be included in how "affected Tribes" is defined. Finally, the requirement for local jurisdictions to complete a Sea Level Rise Vulnerability and Risk Assessment is critically important for the protection of human infrastructure and the protection of shoreline habitats and mitigation of the coastal squeeze. This assessment should depict how the various shoreline hazard areas are designated and managed and is something I strongly support in the new language.

Achieving no net loss of ecological function: No Net Loss of ecological function is foundational to the effective management of shoreline areas. Ecology's inclusion of language ensuring masters programs achieve no net loss of ecological function is a much-needed addition, particularly in elements of the periodic review which ensure any amendments to SMPs do not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological function. The expansion, clarification, and additions of subsections to WAC 173-26-226 Protection of critical areas and shoreline ecological functions is key to more effectively directing local jurisdictions to achieve no net loss of ecological functions in their shoreline areas. These are important additions that I strongly support. However, while mitigation sequencing can work at the permit level at times, when rolled up to the city, county, and state level we are still seeing consistent trends of degrading ecological function as

exhibited by a lack of healthy nearshore and shoreline habitat for salmon, forage fish, and other important species. At times throughout the proposed draft WAC language, Ecology uses language that alludes to achieving a gain of ecological function such as "...that ensure, **at a minimum,** no net loss of ecological...". This language should be included at each instance of achieving no net loss of ecological function.

Effective enforcement and compliance: Strong and clear language in SMAs and subsequent SMPs is essential, but arguably more important is how these regulations and guidance are monitored for compliance and enforced when necessary. The addition of a new section outlining the process for a permit recission by either the local jurisdiction or the state and a new section stating that violators are financially liable for removal of the unpermitted activity **and the cost of restoring the affected area** are extremely important and I strongly support their inclusion in the final language. I suggest this order for removal and remediation also be applicable to unpermitted structures. It is also critically important to keep the citizen or civil suit provision in this section to allow individuals who have been harmed by the actions of violators to hold them accountable at the local and state level. Finally, I am in support of Ecology gathering information from local jurisdictions on exemptions and substantial development permits. Ecology should use this information to publish an annual report across the state to more readily track and enforce no net loss of ecological functions.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments during the informal comment period on the preliminary draft language of the Shoreline Management Act. With your help, we can ensure local jurisdictions are effectively protecting critical shoreline ecosystems to support healthy salmon and shellfish populations, human health, and the built infrastructure in the face of sea level rise and increased storm severity.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jared and Whitney Howe
jaredchowe@gmail.com