

**Responses to Public Hearing Comments on SMP**  
**Responses provided at public meeting**

**1.Kayla Moszer:** Concerned about public access to Pipe Lake & traffic from such access.

**Response:** Public Access is a state required provision along shorelines for new developments. Access will be limited in scope and traffic and safety concerns will be mitigated.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**2.Jeff Weber:** Letter on behalf of Cascade Water Alliance –desires adjustments to language to allow certain utilities in shorelines.

**Response:** Will allow limited utilities in shoreline areas if not economically feasible to locate outside of shoreline areas. **Minor changes to document are appropriate.**

**3.Bruce Gerber:** Requests notice of future meetings.

**Response:** Notice of all future shoreline meetings will be provided to all who provide input at this hearing. **No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**4.Robert Sisung:** Against any future development or access to Pipe Lake.

**Response:** SMP requires public access to the lake from future development.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**5.Lee & Sue Peterson:** Request that State not dictate development of properties along shoreline.

**Response:** State Shoreline Management Act requires control of development along shorelines.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**6.Steve Jenks:** Keep Pipe Lake private with no future public access.

**Response:** State law requires public access from future development.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**7.Judy Rainy:** Keep Pipe Lake private with no future public access.

**Response:** State law requires public access from future development.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**8.Larry Andriesen:** Didn't see wetlands reflected on the SMP maps.

**Response:** Where known from existing data, wetlands are shown. Limited data around Pipe Lake.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

## **Response to SMP Comments from Public Hearing**

**9.Kollin Higgins:** Designate Camp Mccullough as “Natural”, not “Urban Conservancy”.

Response: Evaluation and research indicated “Urban Conservancy” was most appropriate designation.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**10.Ruth Sullivan:** Against future development or public access on Pipe Lake.

Response: Shoreline Management Act requires public access from future development.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**11.Eric Moore:** Against Church Camp development. Wants the future designation to be “Natural”, and not “Urban Conservancy”.

Response: Church determines if they sell property or develop in the future. “Urban Conservancy” is The most appropriate designation and affords adequate protection to sensitive shoreline.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**12.Mike Ford:** Pipe Lake should be kept private with no future development.

Response: If Pipe Lake shorelands are developed, then public access must be provided by law.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**13.Dean Dorcus:** Concerned about future development around Pipe Lake that is private.

Response: Pipe Lake is not private. If there is future development, there must be public access.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**14.Jules Gommi:** Oppose future public access to Pipe Lake

Response: Shoreline Management Act requires public access from future development.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**

**15.Duane Clampit:** Questioned source of funds for this planning project and implementation of future public access.

Response: Funds came from State grant. Funds for future public access would come from developers of the city if land is acquired for a future park.  
**No change to SMP document is appropriate.**