Public and Agency Comment Matrix – Draft Comprehensive Plan and Title 18

This table logs and summarizes public comments received for Draft Comprehensive Plan and Draft Title 18 Zoning. Full comments are attached to the log and the number identified at the top of the first page of the comment corresponds to the comment number in the log. Public Comments received are forwarded to the Planning Commission and City Council.

Comment #	Date Received	Commenter	Method	Summary of Comment	Response
1	11/19/2025	Stephen Graham	Email	Encourages the City to more fully embrace Sequim's strength as a retirement community and build economic-development priorities around it. Supports workforce housing, healthcare, retail, skilled trades and services that support an older population; questions emphasis on tourism and light industry.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft Plan recognizes Sequim's aging population while planning for a diverse community and economy. The Plan supports workforce housing, healthcare/community services, retail and employment opportunities while retaining broader economic-development strategies. Draft Title 18 also expands housing choices and commercial opportunities.

2	2/2/2026	Randy Tierney	Email	Requests additions concerning migratory birds and water supply in Natural Environment policies, including explicit recognition of migratory-bird habitat and water supply in critical-area/resource policies.	Comments acknowledged and revision recommended: Include in Chapter 9 Natural Environment, Policies NE-1.5 and NE-6.3 support for wildlife and migratory birds.
3	2/4/2026	Josh Chapman	Email	Requests that his parcel remain designated Highway Commercial rather than being included in a broader redesignation request.	Comments addressed. Staff's recommendation is to retain the Highway Commercial designation on the parcel while proceeding with consideration of the other redesignation requests.
4	2/6/2026	Puget Sound Partnership	Email	Tools and resources provided by PSP in development of Critical Area Ordinances (CAOs)	Comments acknowledged. The City's existing Critical Areas Ordinance is not being substantively amended through this Title 18 update, and a separate CAO update is anticipated to begin immediately after the periodic update 2026-2027. Staff will retain the Partnership's tools and resources.
5	2/9/2026	Judy Larson	Email	Raises concerns about protection of exempt wells and water availability for those living just outside city limits, and wildlife habitat/corridors.	Comments acknowledged. Water resources, habitat and climate resilience are addressed through the Draft

				Opposes the level of density proposed for certain UGA parcels near Spruce Court/Priest Road.	2025 Comprehensive Plan Land Use, Natural Environment and Climate chapters through various goals and policies.[1] The pre-designation of Regional Commercial (RC) proposed on the FLUM addresses loss of current RC zoned land being converted to CMU through CPA 26-005. The property owners of these parcels have submitted comment letter #27 supporting the pre-designation.
6	4/7/2026	John Worthington	Email	Raises broad concerns regarding Dungeness watershed management, flooding, salmon recovery, Best Available Science, public process, tribal/interagency coordination and past regional restoration decisions. Advocates a watershed approach modeled on Jimmycomelately Creek.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft 2025 Comprehensive Plan contains policies that address the commenter's general concerns regarding Best Available Science, anadromous fisheries, floodplain protection, stormwater management, sediment control, fish and wildlife habitat, watershed health, water conservation, and coordination with Tribes, Clallam County, state and

[1] *Relevant goals and policies include Goals LU-1, LU-12, NE-3, NE-6, and CR-1; Policies LU-1.2 through LU-1.5, LU-9.5, LU-10.1 through LU-10.3, LU-12.1 through LU-12.3, NE-3.1 through NE-3.4, NE-5.3, NE-6.1 through NE-6.6, and CR-1.1 through CR-1.4.*

					federal agencies, special districts, and other partners.[2] Many of the specific watershed-restoration actions in the submission concern facilities, programs or decisions outside City jurisdiction and the scope of the periodic update.
7	4/16/2026	John Worthington	Email	Requests formal evaluation of the proposed Jimmycomelately Dungeness hybrid flood-control and habitat concept and coordinated review by the City, County and other districts/agencies; raises procedural-fairness and interjurisdictional-coordination concerns.	Comments acknowledged. The City supports intergovernmental coordination on regional water, habitat, stormwater, and flood-management matters. The GMA requires coordination among jurisdictions with related regional issues and provides for public participation in comprehensive-plan updates; however, it does not require inclusion of the specific multi-agency technical-review process, hearing schedule, or project-level evaluation requested by the commenter.

[2] *Relevant policies include LU-1.5; LU-11.1–LU-11.2; NE-1.2–NE-1.5; NE-3.1–NE-3.3; NE-4.1–NE-4.2; NE-6.1–NE-6.6; CR-1.1–CR-1.4; CR-2.1; CR-4.1–CR-4.4; CR-5.1; CR-8.3; PI-1.2; and PI-2.3.*

8.A	5/11/2026	John Worthington	Email	Provides technical material advocating the proposed Dungeness/Jimmycomelately approach, including creek diversion, channel configuration, baffling, flood conveyance, sediment management, salmon habitat and water conservation.	Comments acknowledged. The concepts presented relate broadly to Draft Comprehensive Plan policies addressing watershed health, flood resilience, habitat and water conservation. The specific regional engineering proposal is beyond the level of detail and, in substantial part, the jurisdictional scope of this periodic Comprehensive Plan update.
8.B	5/11/2026	John Worthington	Email	Expands on the proposed watershed approach and its claimed benefits for salmon, flood protection, shoreline erosion and water conservation and challenges existing restoration practices.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft 2025 Comprehensive Plan addresses the commenter's general concerns regarding flood-risk reduction, stormwater management, watershed health, salmon and fish habitat, erosion and sediment control, Best Available Science, Tribal stewardship, intergovernmental coordination, and public participation.[3] The specific requests for a multi-agency technical-review

[3] *Relevant policies include LU-1.5; NE-1.2–NE-1.5; NE-3.1–NE-3.3; NE-4.1–NE-4.3; NE-6.1–NE-6.6; NE-7.5; CR-1.2; CR-4.1–CR-4.4; and PI-1.1–PI-2.5.*

					process, a defined hearing schedule, evaluation of a particular river-restoration and flood-control design, and initiation of an interlocal agreement are outside the scope of this Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.
8.C	5/11/2026	John Worthington	Email	Provides additional technical, legal, funding and regional-coordination arguments supporting the watershed proposal and criticizing existing agency practices.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft 2025 Comprehensive Plan addresses the commenter's general concerns regarding watershed health, flood-risk reduction, stormwater management, erosion and sediment control, groundwater recharge, salmon and fish habitat, use of Best Available Science, and coordination with Tribes and regional partners.[4] The City supports coordination with Tribes, Clallam County, special purpose districts, and state and federal agencies on regional water, habitat, stormwater, and flood-management matters. The proposed diversion of

[4] *Applicable policies include LU-1.5; LU-11.1–LU-11.3; LU-12.1; NE-1.2–NE-1.5; NE-3.1–NE-3.3; NE-4.1–NE-4.3; NE-6.1–NE-6.6; CR-2.1; CR-4.1–CR-4.4; PI-1.2; and PI-2.1–PI-2.5.*

					Johnson Creek drainage to the Smith Lake/Bell Creek system, including associated conveyance, channel, habitat, and flood-control features, is a site-specific and multi-jurisdictional proposal.
9	7/15/2026	Eileen Gieser	Online	Reports difficulty using the online Comprehensive Plan materials and requests interactive/live maps that allow users to identify locations more clearly.	Comment acknowledged. Interactive/live map is available on the 2025 Draft Comprehensive Plan website here.
10	7/16/2026	John Worthington	Email	Challenges critical-area treatment near the Planned Resort Community and raises concerns regarding Johnson Creek, Bell Creek, Highland irrigation-ditch flows, WSDOT/US-101 stormwater and cross-jurisdictional drainage. Advocates redirecting or restoring flows to Bell Creek.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft 2025 Comprehensive Plan addresses the commenter's general concerns regarding stormwater management, flood-risk reduction, protection of public and private property, capital-facilities adequacy, groundwater recharge, riparian and local-waterway restoration, salmon habitat, Best Available Science, and intergovernmental coordination.[5]

[5] *Relevant policies include LU-1.4–LU-1.5; LU-11.1–LU-11.3; LU-12.1; CF-1.1; CF-2.1; CF-3.1–CF-3.3; NE-1.1–NE-1.5; NE-3.1–NE-3.4; NE-4.1–NE-4.3; NE-6.1–NE-6.6; CR-2.1; CR-5.1; TR-8.1; and PI-2.3–PI-2.5.*

					The City supports coordination with Clallam County, WSDOT, Tribes, special purpose districts, and other agencies on regional stormwater, habitat, and flood-management matters affecting the City. The specific claims regarding hydrologic conditions, culvert performance, water-quality impacts, regulatory compliance, fish mortality, and legal liability require substantiation and evaluation through the applicable technical, engineering, permitting, regulatory, and interagency processes.
11	7/16/2026	Linda Carlson	Email	Asks whether housing-need figures by income band mean the City expects almost no need for additional housing for households earning above 100–120% AMI.	Comment acknowledged. The housing-allocation figures identified in Appendix A-1 housing need by income are for GMA planning purposes and are assigned by Washington State Department of Commerce. They are not caps on higher-income housing or findings that only the stated number of lower-income households may be accommodated.

12	7/19/2026	Robin O'Malley	Online	Supports the Plan but requests live/interactive maps because the posted maps are difficult to read and locate property on	Comment acknowledged. Interactive/live map is available on the 2025 Draft Comprehensive Plan website here.
13	7/16/2026	Kaileen Mendell	Email	Comments the water/aquifer-management discussion is vague and asks how development approvals account for water availability, particularly in relation to the Westbay/John Wayne Marina area and nearby wells. Requests supporting project studies.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft 2025 Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plan address the commenter's general concerns regarding groundwater protection, aquifer recharge, water conservation, water-system capacity, and growth-related infrastructure.[6] The Capital Facilities Plan Appendix B-1 references the City's adopted 2023 Water System Plan, which evaluates water-system inventory, demand, capacity, deficiencies, and capital improvements. Proposed development would be subject to a separate project-review process, including review of applicable utility capacity, water demand, engineering, environmental,

[6] *Relevant Comprehensive Plan policies include LU-11.1–LU-11.3; LU-12.1–LU-12.3; NE-3.1–NE-3.3; CF-3.1–CF-3.3; CF-5.2–CF-5.4; and CF-6.1–CF-6.4.*

					and development requirements based on the project application and supporting technical information.
14	7/20/2026	Judith Pasco	Email	Raises water-pressure impacts from recent development, increased S. 7th/Silberhorn traffic, housing affordability, limited alternative transportation, shortage of healthcare providers, community character, Westbay impacts and wildlife/habitat loss. Submitted in connection with the Draft SEIS.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plan address the commenter's general concerns regarding water-system capacity, water pressure, fire flow, transportation safety, housing affordability, multimodal access, environmental protection, and growth-related infrastructure. [7] The City's water level-of-service standard requires sufficient flow to meet instantaneous peak demand and projected fire-flow needs. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies a Reservoir Road water main and booster station project intended to provide water flow and pressure for higher-elevation portions of southwestern Sequim, as well as related

[7] Relevant goals and policies include *Goals CF-3 and CF-6; Policies CF-3.1–CF-3.3, CF-6.1–CF-6.4, LU-11.1–LU-11.3, LU-12.1–LU-12.3, H-1.1–H-1.4, H-2.1–H-2.2, H-4.1–H-4.10, H-6.1–H-6.4, NE-1.1–NE-1.5, NE-3.1–NE-3.3, NE-6.1–NE-6.5, CR-2.1, CR-4.1–CR-4.4*

					water-main and looping improvements. The CFP also identifies a future Silberhorn and Seventh Avenue intersection-improvement project, along with other South Seventh Avenue and Silberhorn Road transportation improvements. The City recognizes that access to healthcare and veterinary services and providers is an important community concern. Healthcare facilities and provider capacity are principally managed by independent public, Tribal, nonprofit, and private providers. Individual developments are reviewed separately under applicable development regulations, infrastructure requirements, and environmental-review procedures at the time of project submittal. Revision Recommend: Include in Chapter 6 Capital Facilities a new Policy CF-1.2 supporting coordination with health care providers, public-health

					agencies, and emergency medical-service providers.
15	7/20/2026	John Worthington	Email	Comments that the Plan and CFP omit combined County, City and WSDOT stormwater flows from Bell Hill, US-101 and River Road/Dungeness foothills; raises GMA capital-facilities/concurrency concerns and requests a joint MS4 mapping/capacity audit before adoption.	Comment acknowledged. The Draft 2025 Comprehensive Plan and Capital Facilities Plan address the commenter's general concerns regarding stormwater management, flood-risk reduction, protection of public and private property, watershed health, capital-facility adequacy, and intergovernmental coordination.[8] The Capital Facilities Plan identifies the City's Storm and Surface Water Master Plan as the functional plan for City stormwater management and includes a future update to evaluate existing conditions and strategies for stormwater-system capacity, conveyance,

[8] *Relevant policies include LU-1.4–LU-1.5; LU-11.1–LU-11.3; CF-3.1–CF-3.3; CF-6.1–CF-6.4; NE-4.1–NE-4.3; and NE-6.1–NE-6.6.*

					infiltration, resource protection, and financing. The Plan also provides for future capital improvements and updates to functional plans based on the best available technical analysis.
16	7/21/2026	Washington Department of Natural Resources	Email	Generally, supports the Plan but recommends clearer discussion of critical areas in Land Use and Parks/Open Space, better integration of hazard/climate planning, and clarification of the Geologic Hazard Areas map and terminology. Notes that substantive CAO provisions will be reviewed during the later CAO update.	Revisions Recommended. Chapter 2 – Land Use: add a cross-reference explaining that critical-area protection, climate resilience, and hazard mitigation are integrated land-use considerations and are addressed further in the Natural Environment and Climate and Resilience chapters. Chapter 7 – Parks and Open Space: add in Section 7.2.2 introductory language that park and open-space planning will also protect critical-area functions as required under the City's CAO. Chapter 9 – Natural Environment: clarify narrative, title, legend, and/or note for Figure NE-2 to identify the mapped earthquake, erosion, and landslide hazard information and to state clearly

					whether Areas of Geologic Concern are included on the figure or identified through separate City mapping and development regulations.
17	7/22/2026	Carol von Borstel	Online	Expresses concern that the Critical Areas portion of the City's regulations will be updated after Comprehensive Plan adoption and asks that critical-area protections receive public review before new development occurs.	Comments acknowledged. Existing critical-area regulations remain in effect and continue to apply to development. The scheduled CAO update is a separate legislative process and will include applicable public-review requirements. New development is not exempt from current critical-area regulations.
18	7/22/2026	Arnold Bleicher	Email	Raises detailed concerns about the City's available water margin and planning horizon, future surface-water treatment infrastructure, wastewater loading and unfunded upgrades, healthcare capacity, and inconsistent growth assumptions among Plan chapters and system plans.	Comments acknowledged. City Staff are currently evaluating the comments and questions raised in this letter. Revisions or clarifications may be identified as advisable, and/or addressed in more detail response in a separate memo. The City recognizes that access to healthcare and veterinary services and providers is an important community concern.

					Healthcare facilities and provider capacity are principally managed by independent public, Tribal, nonprofit, and private providers. Revision Recommend: Include in Chapter 6 Capital Facilities a new Policy CF-1.2 supporting coordination with health care providers, public-health agencies, and emergency medical-service providers.
19	7/23/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Supports the Westbay proposal and streamlined permitting. Advocates broader transportation improvements, including highway, ferry and air connections, and mixed-use development around the marina.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft Comprehensive Plan establishes policies for growth, housing, economic development, transportation and coordination but does not approve an individual development project. Individual developments are reviewed separately under applicable development regulations, infrastructure requirements, and environmental-review procedures at the time of project submittal.

20	7/23/2026	Sara	Online	Expresses support for the Planned Residential/Planned Resort community.	Comment acknowledged.
21	7/27/2026	Debbie Minch	Online	Identifies inadequate specialty medical services, need for improved regional transportation/SeaTac connectivity and concern about speeding and traffic growth on Silberhorn.	Comments acknowledged. The City recognizes that access to healthcare services and providers is an important community concern. Healthcare facilities and provider capacity are principally managed by independent public, Tribal, nonprofit, and private providers. Revision Recommend: Include in Chapter 6 Capital Facilities a new Policy CF-1.2 supporting coordination with health care providers, public-health agencies, and emergency medical-service providers. Speed enforcement is primarily an operational law-enforcement matter rather than a Comprehensive Plan amendment.
22	7/28/2026	Dennis Burnett	Online	Expresses concern that continued home construction will cause unacceptable traffic congestion unless transportation impacts are addressed.	Comments acknowledged. The updated 2026 Transportation Master Plan reports existing level of service (intersection delay), evaluates

					planned growth, future traffic conditions and necessary transportation improvements. The TMP model results that citywide, the current street system operates within the adopted level-of-service intersection delay standard. The traffic model identified three intersections that may fail LOS using the 2045 growth projections. These intersections are identified on the transportation improvement project list.
23	7/29/2026	Stephen Graham	Online	Supports the Plan overall but reports low and declining water pressure near S. 7th/Silberhorn as Rolling Hills builds out; notes the planned booster project is not yet constructed/funded and urges infrastructure to precede development. Also raises climate-change impacts on future water and power supply.	The City's water level-of-service standard requires sufficient flow to meet instantaneous peak demand and projected fire-flow needs. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies a Reservoir Road water main and booster station project intended to provide water flow and pressure for higher-elevation portions of southwestern Sequim, as well as related water-main and looping improvements.

24	7/30/2026	Ben Fisher	Online	Requests that adequate water supply, pressure and infrastructure be available before development approval and expresses support for the planned booster serving S. 7th/Silberhorn.	Comments acknowledged. New development is subject to applicable level of service and pressure/fire-flow requirements at the time of development The Capital Facilities Plan identifies a Reservoir Road water main and booster station project intended to provide water flow and pressure for higher-elevation portions of southwestern Sequim, as well as related water-main and looping improvements.
25	7/30/2026	Tony Corrado	Email	Critiques the Plan as overly aspirational and asks for more mandatory/enforceable standards regarding water quality, multimodal transportation, tree canopy, critical areas, wetlands, buffers, aquifer recharge, public environmental information and salmon-habitat restoration.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft Comprehensive Plan provides the City's long-range policy direction[9]; mandatory development standards, permit criteria, technical-study requirements, and enforcement remedies are established through the Sequim Municipal Code, engineering standards, stormwater requirements, and project-specific permit review.

[9] *Relevant Comprehensive Plan provisions include Goal LU-11 and Policies LU-11.1–LU-11.3; Goal LU-12 and Policies LU-12.1–LU-12.3; Goal TR-2 and Policies TR-2.1–TR-2.5; Goal TR-9 and Policies TR-9.1–TR-9.10; Goals NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-5, NE-6, and NE-8 and their associated policies; Goals CR-1, CR-2, and CR-8 and associated policies; and Goals PI-1 through PI-3 and associated policies.*

					The City's mandatory code provisions include SMC Chapter 18.80, Critical and Environmentally Sensitive Areas Protection; SMC Chapter 18.82, Clearing and Grading; SMC Chapter 13.104, Stormwater Management; SMC Chapter 15.06, Site Construction and Right-of-Way Permits; SMC Chapter 16.04, Environmental Policy and SEPA procedures; and SMC Chapter 18.90, Violations, Enforcement, and Remedies. City Staff are currently evaluating the comments and recommendations raised in this letter. Revisions or clarifications may be identified as advisable, and/or addressed in more detail response in a separate memo.
26	8/3/2026	Anne Soule	Online	Identifies a potential tension between water conservation and utility revenue; proposes strengthening LU-12.3/UT-1.8 with climate/sustainability information and regional watershed coordination; proposes similar coordination language in Ch. 10 and identifies typographical errors.	Comments acknowledged. City Staff are currently evaluating the comments and recommendations raised in this letter. Revisions Recommended: Chapter 9: Natural Environment, correct typos as identified in comment letter.

					Additional revisions under evaluation.
27	8/3/2026	Barbara Edmondson	Email	Seven property owners support redesignating four parcels near Priest/Brackett from Low Density Residential to Regional Commercial.	Comments acknowledged. Pre-designation is included on Draft Future Land Use Map.
28	8/4/2026	Don Hanna	Online	Opposes Westbay based on water availability, traffic, lack of need for high-end housing and environmental impacts. Supports affordable housing, infill redevelopment and higher-density development rather than sprawl.	Comments acknowledged. Individual developments are reviewed separately under applicable development regulations, infrastructure requirements, and environmental-review procedures at the time of project submittal. The Draft Plan supports redevelopment and infill of underutilized land, a walkable and connected community, multimodal transportation, housing near services and transportation facilities, and mitigation of development-related transportation impacts.[10] The City's adopted transportation framework also requires maintenance of

[10] *Relevant policies include Goal LU-1 and Policies LU-1.1 through LU-1.5; Goal LU-11 and Policies LU-11.1 through LU-11.3; Goal LU-12 and Policies LU-12.1 through LU-12.3; Goals TR-1 through TR-4 and their associated policies; Goal H-1 and Policies H-1.1 through H-1.4; Goal H-4 and Policies H-4.1 through H-4.10; Goals NE-1, NE-2, and NE-6 and their associated policies; and Goal CR-1 and Policies CR-1.1 through CR-1.4.*

					multimodal level-of-service standards and transportation concurrency. The City's 2026 Transportation Master Plan indicates that current evaluated traffic operations are within the adopted level-of-service standard; individual development proposals remain subject to project-specific transportation, access, safety, and mitigation review.
29	8/5/2026	Carol von Borstel	Online	Calls for more specific water/aquifer protections in light of climate change, reduced snowpack and groundwater concerns; advocates restrictions on deforestation and emphasizes adequate-water determinations for new development.	Comments acknowledged. The Plan addresses water conservation, aquifer protection, climate resilience, and habitat protection,[11] while detailed tree-clearing and critical area standards are through project development regulation and Critical Areas Ordinance.
30	8/5/2026	PRTPO	Email	Regional transportation reviewer concludes that the City's Comprehensive Plan/TMP meets the policies and goals of the regional transportation plan and recommends concurrence.	Agency recommended concurrence acknowledged.

[11] *Relevant goals and policies include Goal LU-12 and Policies LU-12.1 through LU-12.3; Goal NE-3 and Policies NE-3.1 through NE-3.4; Goal NE-8 and Policies NE-8.3 through NE-8.7; Goal CR-1 and Policies CR-1.1 through CR-1.4; and Goal CF-3 and Policies CF-3.1 through CF-3.3.*

31	8/5/2026	S.F. Brown	Online	Opposes the pace and form of development, argues development is damaging Sequim's natural environment, and calls for development-code changes emphasizing environmental protection and sustainability.	Comments acknowledged. The Comprehensive Plan and Title 18 update seek to accommodate the City's required GMA growth while protecting environmental resources and community character. Critical areas and environmental regulations remain applicable, with additional CAO work planned separately.
32	8/5/2026	Ivy Sacks	Online	Raises concerns about growth, infrastructure and water availability; cites Westbay and Rolling Hills as examples; reports increased traffic and reduced water pressure; urges preservation of open space and small-town character.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft Comprehensive Plan provides for orderly growth that respects Sequim's small-city character while accommodating the population, housing, and employment targets assigned to the City. [12] The City's water level-of-service standard requires sufficient flow to meet instantaneous peak demand and projected fire-flow needs. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies a Reservoir Road water main and booster

[12] *Relevant provisions include Goal LU-1 and Policies LU-1.1–LU-1.5; Goals CC-1 through CC-4 and associated policies; Goal H-6 and Policies H-6.1–H-6.4; Goal CF-2 and Policy CF-2.1; Goal CF-3 and Policies CF-3.1–CF-3.3; Goal TR-1, Goal TR-3, Goal TR-4, Goal TR-5, and Goal TR-9 and associated policies; Goals NE-1, NE-2, NE-3, NE-6, and NE-8 and associated policies; and Goals LU-11 and LU-12 and associated policies.*

					station project intended to provide water flow and pressure for higher-elevation portions of southwestern Sequim, as well as related water-main and looping improvements.
33	8/6/2026	S	Online	Requests that Sequim's agricultural history, remaining farms and local farming community be expressly recognized and preserved in the Comprehensive Plan.	Comments acknowledged. The Draft Comprehensive Plan recognizes the Sequim-Dungeness Valley's agricultural setting and history; identifies agricultural heritage as an element of the City's cultural and historic resources; supports climate-resilient local and regional agriculture and local food systems; and supports agricultural activities that contribute to Sequim's economy and tourism.[13] The Draft Future Land Use Map includes an Agricultural Conservancy designation. The designation is intended to maintain agricultural use for the benefit of the urban community through food production and applies to

[13] *Goal LU-2 and Policy LU-2.6; Goal CC-6 and Policies CC-6.1 through CC-6.7 concerning cultural and historic resources; Goal CR-3 and Policies CR-3.1 through CR-3.2 concerning climate-resilient agriculture and local food systems; Goal CR-4 regarding cultural and agricultural heritage; and Goal ED-7 and Policy ED-7.3 regarding agriculture's contribution to Sequim's tourism economy.*

					parcels preserved for agricultural use in perpetuity or through an easement. Policy LU-7.3 directs the City to retain this designation for its long-term benefits. Revision Recommended: Add a new policy to Chapter 3, Community Character, under Goal CC-6, to recognize the Sequim-Dungeness Valley's agricultural heritage and encourage interpretation, public art, events, wayfinding, and partnerships.
34	8/10/2026	Brad	Online	Supports development of the long-zoned Planned Resort Community as the West Bay neighborhood.	Comments acknowledged.
35	8/13/2026	Washington Department of Transportation	Email	Supports the TMP's multimodal focus and analysis of planned growth on US-101, notes the proposed Sequim Avenue roundabout, has no further comments, and requests continued coordination regarding Whitefeather/US-101.	Agency comments acknowledged.
36	8/7/2026	John Worthington	Email	Formal notice alleging GMA deficiencies in stormwater/capital-facilities planning, particularly related to lower foothill drainage,	Comments acknowledged. City Staff are currently evaluating the comments raised in this letter.

				irrigation ditches, Bell Creek/Bagley Creek and cross-jurisdictional facilities. Requests a coordinated capital-facilities audit, updated inventories and various drainage improvements.	
37	8/5/2026	John Worthington	Email	Proposes a large regional watershed/flood-control infrastructure and economic-development program involving bridges, creek excavation/rainshadow systems and local fabrication, with estimated employment and project costs.	Comments acknowledged. City Staff are currently evaluating the comments raised in this letter.
38.A	7/24/2026	E. Randy Tierney	Email	Provides numerous detailed edits to the Comprehensive Plan: landscaping/tree canopy, buffers, utility easements, stormwater infiltration, water conservation, community character, housing terminology, capital-facility wording, litter, wetlands/bays, migratory birds, geologic mapping and minor grammar/typographical corrections.	Comments acknowledged. Revisions recommended based on suggestions in letter.
38.B	7/24/2026	E. Randy Tierney	Email	Suggests changes to Ch. 18.60 Master Plan Overlay concerning bicycle impacts, lighting effects on bird migration, clarity of permitted-use restrictions, City review	Comments acknowledged. Revisions recommended based on suggestions in letter.

				timelines and definition of the "life of the project."	
39	8/6/2026	Jan Tierney	Email	Suggests groundwater monitoring/testing, short-term-rental inventory and possible incentives/caps, drought-tolerant trees and tree retention, use of Best Available Science in several policies, information on non-City water users, and rain gardens/tree planting.	Comments acknowledged. Revisions recommended based on suggestions in letter.
40	8/24/2026	Washington State Department of Commerce	Email	Commerce has concluded its 60-day review of Sequim's proposed Comprehensive Plan and draft development regulations under Planview No. 2026-S-13038. Following staff discussion on August 18, 2026, and the City's written response on August 19, 2026, Commerce determined that the City addressed all items in its August 7 draft comment letter. Commerce does not intend to issue a final comment letter and will close its 60-day review. The City must submit its notice of adoption to Planview within 10 days after adoption.	Agency comments acknowledged.
41	8/25/2026	Seabrook	Email	The commenter is requesting within Draft Title 18: to allow 50-foot PRC building heights, limit the 25-foot single-family height cap to areas	Comments acknowledged. City Staff are currently evaluating the comments raised in this letter.

				within 100 feet of neighboring residential zones, exempt certain architectural features, and allow alternate parking standards supported by professional studies. The letter also recommends clear, objective criteria for determining when alternate master-plan standards are "equal or superior," while maintaining protections for critical areas, concurrency, adjacent properties, and the public.	
42	8/29/2026	Marcia Fagin	Email	Opposes the Westbay/Seabrook development on the grounds of increased traffic and the increased resource draw on police, fire, and ambulatory crews.	Comments acknowledged.
43	8/29/2026	Linda Enger	Email	Objects to the Westbay/Seabrook development due to regulatory issues, infrastructure costs, water supply, changing of community character, and traffic and tourism strain.	Comments acknowledged.
44	8/29/2026	Lynn Bender	Email	Calls for the rejection of new, high-end housing developments with and voices support for more affordable housing, especially apartments.	Comments acknowledged.

45	8/29/2026	Cheryl Tamblyn	Email	The commenter opposes the Seabrook development based on issues of infrastructure, water, and necessary services.	Comments acknowledged.
46	8/29/2026	Michelle Binder	Email	Disapproves of the Seabrook development due to the lack of affordable housing available.	Comments acknowledged.
47	8/29/2026	Robin Youngblood	Email	Objects to the Westbay/Seabrook project due to water availability, ingress/egress to the proposed development location, electrical system fragility, inadequate cell phone coverage, and nearby hospital access.	Comments acknowledged.
48	8/29/2026	Sue Baden	Email	Opposes the Westbay/Seabrook development on the grounds of infrastructure adequacy, water availability, potential impact on small businesses in the City's downtown, and lack of trust in the developer.	Comments acknowledged.
49	8/30/2026	Joe Rowe	Email	Does not support any multi-home developments in the City. Requests that the moratorium on master plans is kept in place indefinitely.	Comments acknowledged.
50	8/31/2026	Raquel Lohrmann	Online	Cites concerns in Title 18 Zoning Code regarding "18.100.010 Authority and Purpose." Proposes	Comments acknowledged.

				issues related to homeless should be handled through the government and not by churches. Specifically cites issues related to a local church food box and trash that is in the surrounding area.	
51	8/31/2026	Judy Larson	Email	Resubmission of comment #5 in this matrix.	Comments acknowledged.
52	8/31/2026	Judy Larson	Email	Requests additional protections for critical aquifers due to increases in impervious surfaces and related changes to quality and quantity of aquifer recharge. The commenter also contends that neither the City nor County have needed monitoring of wells related to their impact on the aquifers. Commenter further requests a verification of the Ranney well's impact on salmonids and further analysis of the Silberhorn deep well project.	Comments acknowledged.
53	8/31/2026	Bob Travis	Email	Objects to the Westbay/Seabrook development due to issues related to: water resources, power issues, growth pressures, lack of infrastructure, critical personnel and changes to community life.	Comments acknowledged.

54	8/31/2026	Sean Patrick Hatt	Email	Commenter states their background in understanding complex systems, and various approaches to solving issues arising from them. Opposes Westbay development due to potential ecological impacts, strain on existing infrastructure, potential damage to small-businesses in the downtown core, and restoration of natural habitats to reduce carbon emission.	Comments acknowledged.
55	8/31/2026	Bob Travis	Email	Restatement of comment #53 in this matrix.	Comments acknowledged.
56	8/31/2026	Lisa Cronin	Online	Commenter opposes the Westbay development due to inadequate infrastructure; lack of workers in the medical, teaching, and retail fields; and concerns about adequate water resources.	Comments acknowledged.
57	9/1/2026	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Email	Department suggests small textual additions to various policies throughout the comprehensive plan, specifically focused on wildlife connectivity to reduce habitat fragmentation and targeting of salmon recovery plans.	Agency comments acknowledged.
58	9/1/2026	Ann Reed	Online	Commenter opposes zoning changes along the south of W Spruce Court and north of W	Comments acknowledged.

				Bracket Rd from Residential to Rural Commercial.	
59	9/1/2026	Kerry McCool	Email	Is against the Westbay development as the commenter is concerned it will be utilized for short term rentals or vacation homes instead of full time residents. Leading to a lack of community ties.	Comments acknowledged.
60	9/1/2026	Darlene Schanfald	Online	Requests the deletion of CR-1.3 to disallow the future use of reclaimed water for potable and non-potable uses.	
61.A	9/1/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Commenter supports the Westbay development and that they Wayne family should be able to develop the property with the selected developer. Suggests a joint venture between the City and State to provide the infrastructure needed for the Westbay development.	Comments acknowledged.
61.B	9/1/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Resubmission of comment #19 in this matrix	See response to Comment #19 of this matrix.
61.C	9/1/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Urges construction of mixed-use buildings in core districts of Sequim and Port Angeles with a thematic architectural style, at least three-stories in height along with aesthetic	Comments acknowledged.

				landscaping. Encourages doing so for greater population density in the downtown core and to save on energy use.	
61.D	9/1/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Submission of letter to Port Angeles Commissioner Kelly Kidwell advocating for transportation alternatives, including commercial air service to Fairchild International Airport, float plane service to larger airports, and ferry service from Port Angeles to Seattle, Victoria, and Anacortes.	Comments acknowledged.
62	9/1/2026	Darlene Schanfald	Email	Condensed version of comment #60 in this matrix.	See response to Comment #60 of this matrix.
63.A	9/1/2026	Rose Marshall	In-Person (Public Hearing)	Print out of online petition via Change.org with a stated 1,658 signatures from multiple states, cities, and municipalities opposing the Westbay/Seabrook development.	Comments acknowledged.
63.B	9/1/2026	Rose Marshall	In-Person (Public Hearing)	Comments opposing the Westbay/Seabrook development from select signatories of the petition submitted as comment #63.A in this matrix.	Comments acknowledged.

64.A	9/1/2026	Carol von Borstel	In-Person (Public Hearing)	Copy of live comment during Public hearing on 9/1/26. Speaks to deletion of CR 1.3 and any use of reclaimed water for potable and non-potable uses.	Comments acknowledged.
64.B	9/1/2026	Carol von Borstel	In-Person (Public Hearing)	Sequim Gazette article covering Dungeness river flows and the Washington State University Clallam County Extension Office's request for the public to reduce water usage.	Comments acknowledged.
65	9/2/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Resubmission of comment #61.C in this matrix.	See response to Comment #61.C.
66	9/2/2026	Brad Griffith	Email	Interest in introducing "satellite bedrooms concepts/ideas" into the Comprehensive Plan as an alternative to Additional Dwelling Units (ADUs).	Comments acknowledged.
67	9/2/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Commenter suggests the City look into partnership with the Pacific Northwest National Lab (PNNL) and Energy Northwest to build and operate a nuclear power generation facility to resolve issues related to power demands from the City, poor tidal flush in Sequim Bay and Discovery Bay, and to address occasional hypoxic water in the bays.	Comments acknowledged.

68	9/22/2026	Bob and Carole Travis	Email	Commenter is concerned about the impact of continued growth on water availability and electrical resources.	Comments acknowledged.
68.A	9/22/2026	Bob and Carole Travis	Email	Copy of League of Women Voters of Clallam County letter to the Washington Water Future Initiative. Includes concerns on the Dungeness river management as well as proposed solutions.	Comments acknowledged.
69	9/23/2026	Sean Evans	Email	Commenter encourages the development of the Westaby/Seabrook project as a public-private cooperative venture. Commenter speaks to benefits of a resort development.	Comments acknowledged.
70	9/30/2026	Chuck Weber	Email	Commenter requests updates to Chapter 9, Natural Environment, to include explicit sections of the Sequim Master Plan instead of inclusion by reference; updates to various policies and sections to protect, enhance, and expand public shoreline access; and creation of a policy in chapter 10 related to environmental factors that could impact future shoreline access.	Comments acknowledged and considered.

71	10/5/2026	Ruby Carlino	Online	Encourages the City to consider long-term sustainability of privately owned infrastructure prior to approval and whether funding mechanisms should be in place to handle rehabilitation or replacement of these systems in future decades.	Comments acknowledged.
72	10/5/2026	Ruby Carlino	Online	Asks if 2025 Economic and Housing Analysis recommendations on neighborhood connectivity should be applied to older, fully developed subdivisions.	Comments acknowledged.
73	10/5/2026	Donald J & Jennifer M Hanna	Email	Opposes Westbay development due to: Traffic and Infrastructure strain, environmental and ecological impact, incompatibility with neighborhood character, and inadequate public benefit.	Comments acknowledged.
74	10/5/2026	Rob Butcher	Email	Requests redesignation of 141 Simdars Rd to Highway/Commercial instead of R4-8.	Comments acknowledged.
75	10/6/2026	Clallamity Jen	Email	Supports the Westbay development and cites their belief that it will create jobs, increase tourism, and support growth in the city.	Comments acknowledged.
76	10/6/2026	Olympic Peninsula	Email	Email acknowledging attached documents (comments #76.A and	Comments acknowledged.

		Audubon Society		#76.B) as comments for the Comprehensive Plan.	
76.A	10/6/2026	Olympic Peninsula Audubon Society	Email	Series of clarification questions and suggested updates regarding zoning designations and various policies from the Comprehensive Plan with an emphasis on the natural environment.	Comments acknowledged.
76.B	10/6/2026	Bob Boekelheide	Email	Supporting comment to comment #76.A, expresses concern for the Pitship pocket estuary if the Westbay development is completed, with particular concern for bird habitats.	Comments acknowledged.
77	10/6/2026	Judy Larson	In-Person	Commenter raises concern that the City's Future Land Use Map (FLUM) does not match Clallam County's Comprehensive Plan map for the same set of properties in the City's urban growth area. Commenter also expresses that the proposed re-zoning of 5 properties is inconsistent with her neighborhood's character. Commenter asks for the City's FLUM to match the County's Comprehensive Plan.	Comments acknowledged.

78	10/6/2026	Kaileen Mendell	In-Person (Public Hearing)	Commenter expresses concern about the City's long-term water planning, especially in relation to the regulatory framework governing water planning. Commenter cites her own experience with a private water system and issues that have arisen with that system. Requests the removal of potable water reuse policy in the Comprehensive Plan (CR-1.3).	Comments acknowledged.
79	10/15/2026	Bruce von Borstel	Email	Commenter created a report on aquifers in the Sequim-Dungeness area. Expresses concern regarding aquifer recharge rates and drawdowns since the 1970s and encourages further studies to better understand what water is available and to do so prior to approving more housing developments.	Comments acknowledged.
80	10/23/2026	Virginia Shogren	Email	The commenter supported Clallam County's withdrawal of the proposed SR-2 to SR-3 rezone for the identified UGA parcels and retention of existing zoning. The commenter also stated that the City's proposed Regional Commercial FLUM redesignation for the same properties is not analyzed in the City's existing FSEIS and would require additional SEPA	Comments acknowledged.

				review before being relied on in future planning or annexation.	
81	10/22/2026	Linda Carlson	Online	The commenter expressed concern that master plan requirements were not addressed and raised objections to the density, amenities, affordability, and traffic impacts associated with the proposed Westbay development and similar projects. The commenter also opposed reduced parking requirements for smaller apartments and housing for extremely low-income and disabled tenants, citing limited transit and continued parking demand.	Comments acknowledged.
82	11/03/2026	Caleb Anderson	Email	Comment requests that outside storage be added as an allowed incidental use to the Mixed Use Districts Use Table, SMC § 18.55.030(C).	Comments acknowledged.
83	11/04/2026	Rob Butcher	Email	Withdrawal of comment #74. Commenter would like their property to remain zoned as R4-8.	Comments acknowledged.
84	11/04/2026	Terri Merrick	Email	Commenter objects to the Westbay development. Cites concerns related to water availability, traffic congestion, pollution, destruction of natural habitat, and infrastructure	Comments acknowledged.

				issues. Concern that future public investments will be needed to support the project.	
85	11/04/2026	Judy Larson	Email	Submittal of seven (7) emails concerning the Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update process. Includes commenter's allegations of non-compliance with the Growth Management Act, issues related to the Critical Areas Ordinance, and the proposed Future Land Use Map (FLUM). Includes re-submissions of comments #5, 51, and 77 as well as comments submitted to Clallam County's Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.	Comments acknowledged.