

**From:** [Julie Vaughn](#)  
**To:** [agenda comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Agenda item 9(c), Discussion of Ordinance 967  
**Date:** Monday, May 23, 2022 9:42:51 AM

---

**CAUTION:** This email originated from outside of the City of Shoreline. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

I apologize for the small error and ask that you use this version:

-----

-----

I frequently take walks from my house via Saltwater Park with my family (back in the day, a child in a backpack) and now dog on a leash, with egress through the north of the beach area. I understand that without the acquisition of the available beach lot, the current tenants along the beach would like to permanently constrict access northbound despite their own access and egress via the bridge that spans the railroad tracks being provided by public funds. This is unneighborly and prevents me from the kinds of walks I enjoy. I will not be able to exit the beach through the same access route due to the steepness of the road up from the beach via the Saltwater park. It seems we have ancient guidelines for this timeless problem in The Public Trust Doctrine:

“By the law of nature these things are common to mankind the air, running water, the sea, and consequently the shores of the sea. ... All rivers and ports are public: hence the right of fishing in a port, or in rivers, is common to all men.”

And women. And dogs (on leashes). And wee children in backpacks or on foot. Yes, the current residents have lovely properties that have an inherent attraction for all people. They benefit from the collective public with an expensive bridge to somewhere, and to keep that on-foot beach access public for all is the only fair solution to this accessibility problem across the railroad tracks. Let's acquire that land and codify access more formally.

Julie Vaughn  
Richmond Beach

On Mon, May 23, 2022 at 8:37 AM Julie Vaughn <[julieranaevaughn@gmail.com](mailto:julieranaevaughn@gmail.com)> wrote:

I frequently take walks from my house via Saltwater Park with my family (back in the day, a child in a backpack) and now dog on a leash, with egress through the north of the beach area. I understand that without the acquisition of the available beach lot, the current tenants along the beach would like to permanently constrict access northbound despite their own access and egress via the bridge that spans the railroad tracks being provided by public funds. This is unneighborly and prevents me from the kinds of walks I enjoy. I will not be able to exit the beach through the same access route due to the steepness of the road up from the beach via the Saltwater park. It seems we ancient guidelines for this timeless problem in The Public Trust Doctrine:

“By the law of nature these things are common to mankind the air, running water, the sea, and consequently the shores of the sea. ... All rivers and ports are public: hence the right of fishing in a port, or in rivers, is

common to all men.”

And women. And dogs (on leashes). And wee children in backpacks or on foot. Yes, the current residents have lovely properties that have an inherent attraction for all people. They benefit from the collective public with an expensive bridge to somewhere, and to keep that on-foot beach access public for all is the only fair solution to this accessibility problem across the railroad tracks. Let's acquire that land and codify access more formally.

Julie Vaughn  
Richmond Beach