JAMES KESSI

As a civil engineer, I worked on many projects in Washington then evolve shorelines. My last experience was a straightforward simple 10 lot subdivision that was grade separated and also physically separated from a from Sam Creek stream by a Tulane major minor arterial that itâ€™s a county road, even though the site was physically separated, and there was no impact at all to the stream because of this existing road that had been there for over 100 years the Shoreline the current Shoreline restrictions are such that they have no common sense provisions in them and donâ€™t exclude anything, even if thereâ€™s no impact at all by the project on the creek, which is on the other side of the major road. Whatever you do, thereâ€™s been there will be no good. If you increase the regulations in fact, the recommendation is to decrease the amount of regulations and put in more provisions for common sense exclusions, and or accommodations for existing conditions, especially and really what what are we trying to do because the amount of cost and effort to try to comply with the very very specific and offer and mostly overbearing. Shorelineâ€˜s regulations ends up really not accomplishing much more than just using common sense on how to approach a project. This 10 lot subdivision probably had an extra hundred thousand dollars associated with the shorelines compliant with the Charlene act even though there is no impact at all, this includes extra permitting, the extra time hiring extra consultants and then also demonstrating all this information through the planning process and then having to comply with specific limitations on doing anything in a Shoreline area buffer that has no physical connection or any kind of connection to the actual stream itself, which is a travesty. Please wake up and revise the existing Charleneâ€˜s management act to have specific provisions and exemptions to allow for existing conditions and have some common sense built in. Why does this a small stream that doesnâ€™t why does it need a 200 to 300 foot buffer . in an urban designated area designated for Urban Groth. So this hundred thousand dollars of extra cost for the shoreline permit added roughly $10,000 per house so I just made the houses that much more affordable un affordable for the average buyer $10,000 an extra cost per house per lot for what thereâ€™s no difference. The project is not any better because of it and the lots are not any better because of that and the impacts to the stream or weâ€™re not reduced at all because everything was already separated by by the road, I strongly oppose any increase in trial management act rules that increase any buffers wits or anything in fact, I think you should go to the opposite way to reduce and Iâ€™ve got more common sense provisions

I understand the importance of planning for future risks. Nobody wants homes built in unsafe places, and it makes sense for communities to prepare for sea-level rise and other climate-related challenges. My concern is that this proposal goes well beyond planning and starts creating new barriers to housing at a time when Washington is already struggling with a housing shortage. Land costs are up, fees are up, and regulations keep piling on. This feels less like a planning effort and more like another housing constraint.
Washington needs more homes, but that becomes harder to achieve every time more land is taken off the table or new requirements are added to the development process. At some point, we need to acknowledge the tradeoffs. If these rules make it harder to build housing, they will make housing more expensive. We can prepare for future climate impacts without undermining housing affordability. Ecology should revise this proposal to ensure climate planning doesn"t come at the expense of the homes Washington families need today.