



## JEFFERSON COUNTY

### PLANNING COMMISSION

621 Sheridan Street

Port Townsend, WA 98368

(360) 379-4450

Minutes of the Critical Areas Committee Meeting  
November 2, 2006, 7pm  
WSU Learning Center  
Shold Business Park, Spruce Room  
201 West Patison  
Port Hadlock

Planning Commission: Jim Hagen, Peter Downey, Henry Werch and Dennis Schultz  
Advisors: Norm MacLeod, Jim Tracy, Bill Wheeler, John Richmond, Kathy Dickson, Diane Johnson, Sandy Hershelman, Kenn Brooks, Amy Hiatt, Dianne Bonnivier-Holman, Jill Silver, George Yount, Roger Short and Robert Crittenden  
Staff: Rachel McHugh and Josh Peters

---

#### Summary:

The Planning Commission Critical areas subcommittee meeting was called to order in the Spruce Room at the WSU Learning Center at 7:04 pm by Chair Jim Hagen. Planning Commission members present were Peter Downey, Dennis Schultz, Jim Hagen and Henry Werch. Advisory members present were Norm MacLeod, Jim Tracy, Bill Wheeler, Diane Johnson, Sandy Hershelman, Kenn Brooks, Amy Hiatt, Dennis Holman, Jill Silver, George Yount, Roger Short and Robert Crittenden.

Public Comment was open at 7:05. No comments were made.

Sub-groups were discussed. J. Hagen mentioned a memorandum Kenn (Brooks) sent to the Committee. K. Brooks explained he is putting together a small 'white paper' since members want to start getting into specifics; the memo is asking different Committee members to take on different tasks; win-win situations do exist; the challenge for the Committee is to figure them out. J. Hagen suggested something interesting was mentioned at the end of the last meeting; consideration of the no net lose requirement; the Committee has to define what it means to protect; what data does the County have of where we are since '04; where is the County losing, if we are losing at all. J. Peters answered the no net lose was federal from the first Bush administration; for the shoreline master program effort the County is doing right now, the county is trying to establish a baseline from which review situations for the adoption of the next master program in about seven years or so; GMA doesn't prescribe the same as shorelines in terms of no net loss. J. Silver suggested that's is why it is so important to have accurate baseline maps in the County; the County can't track no net loss with the information available now; if County staff is supported at the GIS level information data can be improved; if the County doesn't start now with a baseline, changes won't be able to be identified. Maps and data were discussed as well as support for GIS updates. J. Hagen question meeting the requirements of law and being defensible; do we need increased protection. H. Werch suggested the question of increased protection was a separate question; the establishment of a baseline is important; he thought the Committee should agree better maps are needed; funding should be found and move on. G. Yount reminded the Community may have to come to some parameters until data is available that justifies them (buffers etc) being a different size; the Committee may have to come to that first before getting to the other. Data available in the County was discussed including federal and state databases.

J. Hagen returned the discussion to the memorandum. K. Brooks explained he had assigned people to different issues; the Committee needs to have some background work to agree on. H. Werch didn't think

the Committee needed that for the work done on agriculture; he heard almost universal consensus of what the agriculture component should look like. J. Hagen suggested the agenda included more than agriculture; he reminded the Committee that one of the sub-groups was agriculture; a final solution has not been reached; it's premature to come to any conclusion until the Committee hears from that sub-group. Previous discussions on agriculture were debated. Katherine Baril informed the Committee that she and Al (Latham) had a little ag meeting; she would summarize for the group what they thought they had heard; 1) The Committee liked the intro to the Island County/rhetoric. 2) They wanted the ag exemptions in 'plain English', 3) eliminate 2 definitions pre-4/28/03 and post-4/28/03, 4) Ag buffers should be site specific. A. Latham suggested he and Katherine had been at different meetings; he has gone through different definitions; the sub-group is looking for a mechanism to expand to other areas that should be kept available for agriculture. There was debate over the intent of previous ag discussions. A. Hiatt suggested looking at other codes and extracting definitions. Different types of agriculture and definitions were discussed and past discussions were debated further. How broad the definition of agriculture was also discussed. Whether different types of agriculture, primarily food production verses non-food production, should have different standards or buffers was discussed. K. Baril reminded the Committee Island County has not dealt with 'new' ag; they say they are going to go back and now. P. Downey reminded the Committee that the County is not going to go out to every farm and make sure of what is growing; it would be a nightmare for the County and the farmers. K. Baril informed the Committee that ecology had told her water rights have to be defended if a change is made. P. Downey and Jim Tracey stated this was inaccurate. P. Downey added not everything ecology says should be believed. K. Brooks added he would like to see the Committee be creative in protecting resources in a way that's not overly burdensome. N. MacLeod suggested more public education on exemptions was needed. A. Hiatt asked if the Committee could define what they were considering 'new' ag.

J. Hagen mentioned the motion on Island County from a previous meeting. What that motion meant to different Committee members was debated. J. Silver understood the vote was on standardizing farm plans, clarifying the code and making it easier to read; she voted on following the model, not the content. H. Werch recalled the discussion the whole of the model would be taken, not a part, everything; there was hope expressed that staff and the Committee could use what the Conservation District has done. R. Crittenden remembered that the Committee wanted to bring in standard plans. D. Schultz's impression was that the Chemicum Plan would be the de-facto farm plan. N. Stelow remembered the Committee deciding Island County read like they had been in our meetings. Island County was discussed further. N. MacLeod added he understood there was no statutory support under GMA for 'exemptions'; alternative regulations allow for working 'outside the line'. P. Downey reminded the Committee to keep in mind when the County gets involved; generally farmers have no reason to go to the County; only when putting on a building do you approach the County for a permit. J. Tracy agreed, but reminded the Committee there can be compliance issues. Island County Farmers and their monitoring program were discussed. A. Latham urged the Committee to consider all of the water monitoring and data collecting work that had been done in Jefferson County; rather than imposing regulations, take care of problems; imposing farm plans on people is not the right thing; he'd really hate to see framers already doing good work have to do farm plans. D. Schultz added there is a big difference between monitoring and enforcing. A. Latham pointed out a difference between Island County and Jefferson is that they are starting a monitoring program; Jefferson County already has one. N. MacLeod suggested getting into place language that says if farms are doing well, they don't have to do a whole lot until there is a problem. A. Latham suggested the Chemicum Plan is performance based; the Conservation District is monitoring stream reaches; they go to individual farms, if there is a problem; and work with farmers to fix it. J. Silver suggested the success in Chemicum is needed for the whole County.

For the CMZ sub-group R. Crittenden stated J. Tracy was looking into whether CMZ should be in the CAO. P. Downey stated for a shoreline update he was half-way toward a 'white paper'.

Public comment was open at 9:54pm. J. Fritz expressed concern for food security; some wild hogs broke through fences in California and caused e-coli problems; he also expressed concern for the situation with elk in Clallam County. A. Latham stated he had taken George (Yount) out for a quick tour; he was happy to do so for anyone else. M. Belinski asked for a date for the September 21 motion on a memo of motions (April 1). Comment closed 9:55pm.

An Island County comparison was discussed further.

The schedule for meetings during the holiday session was discussed, but no conclusion was made. R. Crittenden would brief the Committee on the CMZ sub-group's progress. H. Werch suggested a

presentation from the Jefferson County Land Trust on their local experience with wildlife habitat corridors through the Quimper Peninsula. D. Schultz added the approach the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area (FWHCA) is taking; the process for species of local significance, the sub-group is looking into who can nominate; the corridors are vague; a presentation from the Land Trust would fit right in with the voluntary approach the sub-group wants to take. B. Wheeler offered the sub-group update was far enough along they could present after the Land Trust.

Meeting closed 10:05pm.

Conclusions:

The Jefferson County Land Trust would be invited to a future meeting where the FWHCA sub-group would also give a formal update.

The next meeting would be a preliminary update from the CMZ sub-group.