

Shoreline Charrette Primer

October 12 – 14, 2006 · Inn at Port Hadlock

Friday 10/13/06 – Joint STAC & SPAC Meeting Notes

Location: Inn at Port Hadlock – Skyview Conference Room

Attendees: *Staff & Consultants* – Project Team members Josh Peters, Michelle McConnell, Margaret Clancy, Kent Hale, Shannon Bartkiw, Gabrielle LaRoche. (6)

Committee Members – Peter Bahls, Al Bergstein, Karen Best, Scott Brewer, Richard Brocksmith, Dick Broders, John Cambalik, Larry Crockett, Hans Daubenberger, Jeff Davis, Peter Downey, Aleta Erickson, Jerry Gorsline, Sarah Krueger, Eveleen Muehlethaler, David Roberts, Hugh Shipman, Stephen Stanley, Jeffree Stewart, Steve Todd, (20)

Audience – About 10 members of the public attended, of which 7 signed the attendance sheet

Materials: *Committee Materials* - Final agenda dated 10-11-06; Draft Inventory & Characterization Report Table of Contents; Excerpted SMA-SMP Definitions handout; Reach Inventory Summary handout; Draft STAC meeting summary;

Optional Materials Available on the General Information Table – Ecology handout “Introduction to Washington’s Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58)”; DCD memo dated 7/6/06 “Comprehensive Update to Shoreline Master Program” with 7-27-06 “SMP into Comp Plan & UDC” diagram; DCD handout “Shoreline Smarts Pop Quiz”; DNR handout “Recreational Mooring Buoys”; Jefferson County booklet “Country Living At Its Best”; Jefferson County booklet “Agriculture in Jefferson County”;

8:30 am SMP Update Project Coordinator Michelle McConnell with Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD) welcomed committee members and the audience to open the second session of the Shoreline Charrette Primer. Staff, consultants and members of the STAC and SPAC introduced themselves around the table.

8:35 am While no one had signed the Public Comment Sign-up Sheet, Michelle asked the audience if there was any comment to be made, and reminded that another comment period was scheduled at the end of the agenda. No public comment was made.

8:40 am Michelle introduced members of the ESA Adolfson team present (Kent Hale, Shannon Bartkiw, and Gabrielle LaRoche) and the Adolfson Project Lead Margaret Clancy who gave a daylong presentation with her colleagues on the Draft Shoreline Inventory & Characterization (I&C) Report. The slideshow presentation will be posted to the project website, and the following statements and discussions were made (answers/responses are in *italics* following questions/statements):

- The purpose of the report is to meet the Guidelines (WAC 173-26) and the obligations of the County’s Ecology grant contract scope of work.
- The report describes the findings of an ecosystem characterization and a reach inventory & analysis.
- This report is only one step of the SMP update process, is not a policy document, and represents only 20% of the total project budget; the Restoration Plan will be a complementary document.

- The geographic scope = the 5 Water Resource Inventory Areas (WRIAs) = 31 basins → 122 reaches (10 lake; 49 stream; 63 marine Nearshore) and WRIA 16 in Jefferson County is 70% public lands
- Approximately 600 shoreline miles = 61% River/Streams; 37% Marine Nearshore; and 2% Lakes
- Shorelines with federal and tribal land ownership not included are:
 - Marine nearshore on Pacific Coast
 - Olympic National Forest
 - Olympic National Park
 - Indian Island
- There may be other shorelines to add to the SMP based on legal definitions, but they're not currently included in project scope, such as:
 - Additional tributaries to Clearwater and other rivers
 - Beausite, East Wahl, Horseshoe, Ludlow, Rice and Teal Lakes
- SPAC member Scott Brewer asked if the I&C Report defines the “no net loss” (NNL) standard? *In part. The guidelines require that the report describe baseline conditions at various spatial scales at a level of resolution that is sufficient to develop policies and regulations that maintain shoreline ecological functions. In many cases additional, site-specific, baseline information will be needed to make permit decisions and determine mitigation standards as shoreline developments are reviewed and evaluated. So the baseline information in the report is not intended to be a single and complete source of information.*
- SPAC member Peter Downey noted that ecological functions need to be better defined – things are too salmon-centric. There needs to be more on shellfish, needs a broader look.
- Could we capture future funding needs in this report? *We are required to identify potential restoration funding sources in the restoration plan, but not in the I&C report.*
- The State is very salmon focused so it's the playing field we've got.
- DCD Lead Planner & SMP Project Manager Josh Peters asked if there's more data from DNR and noted that the I&C is not for land use.
- I&C components describe Nearshore Habitat, Marine Mammals, Salmonids, Primary Wildlife Habitat and Core Areas, Coastal Bluffs, etc.
 - STAC and SPAC member Jeff Davis asked if there was a reason why no Roosevelt elk were noted in the west end. He was not sure if the WDFW data shows they are present there.
 - SPAC member Jerry Gorsline asked about the difference between “recent” and “historic” landslides. *These categories are defined by ShoreZone*
 - SPAC member Larry Crockett asked if cubic volume or other criteria define a landslide. *No, its based on physical evidence of slope instability but there's no specific threshold.*
 - STAC member Hugh Shipman, a coastal geomorphologist responded that “recent” generally refers to an area where a landslide scar is still visible for a few years after the occurrence. The Coastal Zone Atlas is the data source.
 - Peter D. asked how a “protected” beach was defined. *ShoreZone definition*
 - Jerry asked if those beach classification criteria and landslide definitions are included in the I&C and suggested adding them as footnotes to assist the reader
 - STAC member Steve Todd asked about the source for the eelgrass data. *ShoreZone, Hirschi, MRC and others; some data are map layers, some are narrative text*). He also asked if the data only show where eelgrass is patchy or continuous, rather than total mapping of presence/absence *Yes, both patchy and continuous areas are delineated.*
- Shore forms include accretional shores and feeder bluffs (data not complete)
- Drift cells are areas with generally defined and consistent net shore sediment transport patterns

- Watershed scale assessment identified “important areas”; areas that are important to the continued function of watershed processes, and not to imply that other areas are not important for similar processes or as habitat or other functions.
 - 3 processes were assessed: Hydrology, Sediment, and Water Quality
 - “Important Areas” and alterations were identified
 - Methodology similar for freshwater
 - STAC member Stephen Stanley noted that the assessment is made at a coarse scale and the term “important” is relative to various sites within the total area being assessed. Also that important freshwater areas may not be comparable to important marine areas. *The term “important areas” will be changed to “process-intensive areas” as this is a more appropriate term.*
 - STAC and SPAC member John Cambalik noted his concern that only feeder bluffs were included, not drift cells. *Margaret responded: If drift cells were added too then the entire marine nearshore would be “important” and there would be no way to differentiate between reaches*
 - Jeff asked how will NNL be accomplished without including drift cells
 - Hugh warned the group to be careful in using methods/criteria, that they must be tied to specific functions – “important areas” must be narrower than “everything”
 - Peter noted that this will affect policy decisions of protection levels. *“Important” not meant to imply policy determinations, but describe landscape characterization* He continued that this has to mesh with GMA/SMA *Margaret urged the group not to confuse “important areas” with “critical areas”*
 - Stephen added that Battelle has developed and scored nearshore reaches for processes and that he and Susan Grigsby (Ecology) are also working to score upland processes for their effect on the nearshore.
 - STAC and SPAC member Hans Daubenberger asked why feeder bluffs are included but not deposition areas *Margaret responded that the term “important area” is a relative term and that there can be no deposition without sediment input from a feeder bluff.*
 - John added that if good accretion areas are included as “important” but the transport reach of the drift cell is obstructed then the drift cell habitat forming process may be broken.
 - Larry noted that the assessment looks ok this way, the similar approach worked for City of Port Townsend – everyone seems to agree that feeder bluffs start the sediment transport process.
 - Margaret noted that the watershed scale assessment looks at processes, not specific reaches/sites
 - Steve asked about Map 11 *Margaret responded that that was a poor mapping choice that could be fixed. The “stable” areas identified by ShoreZone are not shown*
 - Hugh asked that besides the Tala to Kala study, where does Coastal Geologic’s sub-consulting work fit in *Margaret responded that Jim Johannesen’s work provides background information on geology but no additional mapping or classification, which is different than the Whatcom County project where additional funds were provided for ground-truthing data collection*
 - Jeff asked the definition of “stable” *Hugh responded that it could mean many things – he’s not sure of the criteria ShoreZone used nor what was mapped as “stable”. The Coastal Zone Atlas was more clear on their criteria and is a better source. Adolfsen team planner and GIS specialist Kent Hale added that ShoreZone only used 3 labels and it was perhaps a poor choice to exclude that from the mapping.*
 - Jerry noted that given the amount and content of discussion, the Adolfsen team might consider providing better definition and context for the term “important”. *Stephen added that they could help define the term better from the “landscape analysis” perspective. Margaret agreed that they could improve this and noted that Whatcom County used the term “process intensive areas”.*

- Alterations were identified for their effects on Hydrology (forest development; development in permeable areas/wetlands), Water Quality (septics; dairies; wetland losses; development) and Sediment (road density; landslides; road/stream intersections).
 - Larry asked about barriers on farms - reasoning that dairies have milk but farms have cows – and was curious of the data source. *The data labeled “dairies” is really dairy farms not dairy processing plants, so the map will be changed to clarify this. Stephen noted that the Agricultural lands layer is generally used*
 - Peter asked whether using “development” layers captures all roads and houses since there are different impacts from different types of development *Margaret responded that industrial, residential, and commercial land use are included and that due the coarse scale nature of the analysis, data gets lumped together.*
 - John noted that he’d provided a table of Ecology-permitted outfalls with his comments *Michelle confirmed receipt of that and that that would be passed along to the Adolfsen team*
 - SPAC member David Roberts asked about how shellfish closures related to mooring buoys and health concerns were represented (e.g. Marrowstone ,Hadlock, Mats Mats) *Margaret responded that they’d have to be mapped by presence not just by permitting information since some are not permitted. David noted there are some newer data available.*
 - Peter asked if anchoring is also included in new data *David clarified that it’s just buoys for now*
 - Hans asked why forest practices is not included under Water Quality alterations *Margaret responded that because Hydrology is related to everything (including sediment and water quality) they left forest practices under hydrology only.*
 - Steve added that hydrology is the driver and asked if forest cover would be reflected in the data.
 - John added that 3 of the 4 alterations in Water Quality are pollution sources. Forest practices are often a source of pollution due to the herbicides and sediment inputs. *David noted that the Forest Practice Rules are designed to meet water quality standards*
 - Scott asked how the alterations affect NNL requirement. *Margaret responded that they provide an understanding of the ecological baseline of today’s shoreline conditions, but in many cases the important areas and alterations occur outside of shoreline jurisdiction, so the SMP will have no effect on this areas. In that respect that are not part of the NNL equation.*
 - Stephen added that alterations can be viewed as an overlay useful for if/when restoration should occur outside the shoreline area.
 - Scott asked if maintaining the baseline is considered mitigation and improving the baseline is considered restoration. *Yes, Josh clarified that mitigation would be part of new development applications and permits. Stephen added that restoration is a non-regulatory method.*
 - Scott noted that the SMP may serve as leverage for other restoration work outside the shoreline area
 - Peter D. noted the interface between the critical areas ordinance (CAO) and SMP is still unclear
 - Josh reminded the group that this is a large scale characterization that could also help guide mitigation outside the shoreline
 - John noted that the conversation was drifting towards the cumulative effects of the SMP
 - Ecology Project Officer and STAC and SPAC member Jeffree Stewart noted that the SMP process aims to integrate restoration planning under the Shoreline Master Program with other efforts already underway by the various local conservation groups and also whatever developer-incentive efforts can be initiated in accordance with the restoration plan.
 - Josh noted that some of these CAO/SMP issues are still being discussed at the state and court levels; we need to be patient in some ways for further clarification rather than get stuck on the issue here

- Important Areas for Hydrology, Sediment and Water Quality look at infiltration, water storage, landslides, channel migration zones (CMZs), surficial aquifers, headwater streams, floodplains, and depressional wetlands.

10:25 am Break

10:45 am The group re-convened. Kent took the lead to discuss shoreline jurisdiction and land use patterns:

- Washington Trout and NW Watershed Institute recently completed a statewide assessment of lakes finding that up to 25% that meet the WAC criteria are not currently included.
 - For Jefferson County, 6 lakes were identified that could/should be added (previously noted), and 2 more lakes have been identified by a '98 survey (Browns Lake and Thorndyke Lake).
 - STAC member Peter Bahls noted that there's also a lake east of Wahl Lake called Twin Lakes or East Wahl that doesn't show on the slideshow graphic. Fred Hill Materials owns the lake and a wetland scientist has already identified it as over 20 acres. *Margaret responded that at this time the project is using the WAC list of shorelines in SMP jurisdiction. There is currently a rule change being proposed by Ecology that would require local jurisdictions to identify what shorelines meet the SMA criteria as part of the update process and the new list would trump the WAC list. For Jefferson County, that issue is now in the "parking lot" and needs to be resolved with Ecology. One limitation is that expanding the WAC list is not currently part of the Ecology grant contract, nor the Adolphson contract, so there are no funds available to do that work of re-working the various data layers to include any additional stream/river reaches or lakes.*
 - Larry asked how lake boundaries are currently identified. For example, Lake Leland floods seasonally into its associated wetlands on the other side of the highway. *The lake boundaries were based on the hydrograph data provided by Jefferson County. Its unclear if the flooded area of the adjacent wetland would be considered to be within the lakes's OHWM. This must be determined in the field at the time of permit review. Stephen noted that Whatcom County looked at including potential wetland areas. This needs to be determined on the ground upon permit application to expand available data and get better boundary definition. Margaret agreed the same is true for Jefferson County. The Jefferson county analysis also includes potential wetland areas using the same approach as Whatcom County. In this case, the wetlands on the other side of the highway are mapped and may be determined to be associated wetlands or part of the lake itself, but our current mapping does not allow us to determine without additional field inspection.*
 - Stephen asked if lakes are determined by the hydric soils. *The Lakes boundaries are not based on hydric soils, but hydric soils areas were used to identify potential wetlands.*
 - Stephen urged that there be a policy process set up for property owners regarding this data gap. *Margaret noted that it could be policy and/or regulations such as was done in Whatcom County.*
 - Peter D. noted that it seems like there's about 9 lakes missing from the WAC list that meet the SMP criteria. He asked what it would take to verify them, if it was that big a deal – that he doubted it was a \$100K project. *High resolution GIS data is needed, have a wetland scientist do site visits to take readings around the lake.*
 - Josh asked Peter B. what it would cost if we opted to do that. *Peter B. responded it would be about \$2,000 per lake. He also noted that Ecology was supposed to be updating the WAC every 5 years but was now proposing that jurisdictions do that themselves. Margaret added there would additional labor costs to analyze the new data and incorporate it into the existing analysis.*

- Jeff asked if there was any reason the WT/NWI information would be rejected and wondered why the county would have to pay even more money to verify what WT/NWI had already done. *Peter B. clarified that their GIS estimates would need to be field verified. Margaret clarified that we would not reject the work that had been done, but might need to supplement it.*
- Margaret asked Peter B. if they had looked at water depth in their study. *Peter B. responded that they'd only field verified the ordinary high water boundary.*
- In terms of existing land use patterns, the County's west end is rather sparse, and the east end has land use primarily focused along the marine shoreline.
- Land use zoning along shorelines breaks down as follows:
 - Marine nearshore = 68% rural residential; 9% military; and a mix of others at lower percentages
 - Rivers = 53% commercial forests; 31% rural residential and a mix of others
 - Lakes = 30% rural residential; 23% parks/preserves/recreation; 21% commercial forests and others
- Future land use and potential conflicts exist where areas of the greatest development pressure overlap areas with greatest resource protection needs or restoration opportunities.
- Development pressure on the east end is focused on the existing population centers which are along the marine shoreline (e.g. urban growth areas or 'UGAs')
- Public access data from a study by the Point No Point Treaty Council shows a variety of parks and open space for water-dependent or water-oriented recreation (boating, fishing, shellfishing, hiking, camping, wildlife viewing) with over 50 boat ramps on the marine nearshore (~20% are public), and over 250 private stairways to the beach documented (some not documented if not permitted).
- Other shoreline uses include water-dependent uses like commercial shellfish/aquaculture, industrial (e.g. Mats Mats quarry, PT paper mill), private marinas, and port facilities.
- Larry noted the proper name is Hudson Point and suggested dropping it from the slide as it's located in City of Port Townsend. *Kent and Margaret agreed*
- Margaret then continued the presentation & discussion with a review of the Reach Inventory and handed out a summary document to committee members. A table organized by element and the four key WRIAs the group took a few minutes to look at the hand out, then asked questions and discussed the information presented.
- STAC member Richard Brocksmith commented that some of the eelgrass statements are misleading.
- Margaret clarified that the summary was meant to highlight findings and may not be fully inclusive of all contents in the I&C Report.
- **Peter** asked who made the mapping assumptions. *Margaret responded that the GIS data came from Jefferson County and other "readily available sources" and noted that this I&C portion of the project has exceeded the \$42,000 budgeted. A lot of unanticipated effort went into sorting and compiling data. She clarified that no new data were collected and no field verification was conducted but new data can be added to the database as they become available. Josh added that the timing of data availability is also important to the bigger picture and this data can be used for more than just the SMP update (i.e. other planning processes, permit review, etc.)*
- Richard again commented that for the example of eelgrass, the ShoreZone data gives a false impression.
- Jeff asked if this data will be used to determine the shoreline environment designations (SEDs). *Josh responded that the SEDs will be based on composite information including the I&C findings.*
- SPAC member Karen Best asked if these maps are not considered accurate, can the same problems be anticipated with the CAO? *Josh responded that with all maps they are never 100% "accurate" in that field verification is needed for various data sets on a site by site basis. Margaret clarified there is a difference between "accurate" and "complete". The maps are accurate to the extent data are available. Margaret also clarified that there are challenges to displaying all of the data on a small sheet of paper and that just*

because something is not depicted on the printed map does not mean we don't have the information. The maps are a partial graphic depiction of all the data in the GIS database. Josh added that the intent of this process is to gain input to aid our policy decisions and that the data collected thus far will allow for a great improvement over the current SMP.

- SPAC member Al Bergstein asked for clarification on the caveats that go with the report and maps so that when the SMP based on them is implemented any such gaps can be caught. *Margaret noted that unfortunately, most data rarely is as detailed as the parcel level. Richard added that data is limited.*
- Hugh noted that the ShoreZone reaches are much smaller than the I&C Report reaches (22 I&C vs. 407 SZ) and that the work Battelle is doing for the nearshore areas will address a finer scale of data analysis.
- Peter D. noted that the quality of the data is what it is and we just need to deal with it that way.
- John asked about an adaptive management plan so that when new data are available there can be some sort of feedback loop for the implementation of the SMP. *Josh responded that that was certainly a possibility, but would depend on details like who, what, when and how that effort would be funded. This would need to be worked out as a separate effort as it is not part of the required SMP Update process.*
- Larry commented that this SMP update process is still a new one – no jurisdiction has actually completed with Ecology approval (Port Townsend is close!). Ecology seems to be receptive to changes and improvements to the process that results in a better product.
- Josh noted that it is possible to make smaller amendments to the SMP between the 7-year update cycle. The hope is that the freshwater scoring will help with SMP implementation and permitting processes. He also noted that the timing of the CAO and the SMP is transitional right now. *Jeffree added that Ecology and other departments are working to smooth that process*
- Margaret noted that other jurisdictions have and will take slightly different routes through the update process. The tools we have to work with may be different than what other jurisdictions have. For example King County got significantly more funding for their inventory work. It's important to have a good dialogue with Ecology [and the shoreline planning commission.
- John noted that we also need to look to the ongoing salmon recovery process for applicable tools. *Josh added that the Restoration Plan is clearly related to the SMP, but should be a useful tool to other partners and the County needs partners to help make it happen.*
- Peter D. noted that the tribes have good data on natural shellfish beds. *SPAC member Aleta Erickson added that WDFW also has good data on this.*
- Peter D. suggested that shellfish beds should be identified as ecological functions and protected as such. *Margaret asked if he'd differentiate commercial beds from natural beds. Peter D. responded no, that it was simply a policy question.*
- John noted that there has been significant work on recovering native Olympia oyster populations with replanting beaches and locating remnant populations.
- Josh noted that we need help from the STAC (and SPAC) to identify missing data. *Peter D. noted DOH shellfish bed classifications. Peter B. noted forage fish maps, bulkhead/shoreline hardening data, marine (anadromous) fish distribution data layers.*

12:25 pm Lunch

1:00 pm The group re-convened. Margaret continued the presentation to discuss the NNL concept.

- No net loss of ecological functions – to accomplish this look at several factors:
 - Baseline conditions
 - Protection policies
 - Mitigation
 - CAO regulations – as defined by ESHB 1933

- Cumulative impacts
- Josh noted that Jefferson County has had an SMP on the books since ~1979. Currently an exemption is a permit and SEPA still applies.
- Peter B asked how do we know what parts of the '89 SMP need revision. *Josh responded that the '00 Draft SMP looked at the '89 deficiencies and the '03 Guidelines help guide the revision as well. Margaret added that the I&C also helps identify opportunities for improvement as well as the Consistency Report.*
- Jeffree noted that the Inventory and Characterization was a crucial step towards effective land use management based upon real and current conditions on the ground. He noted Pierce County as an example (the SMP for which has not been updated in decades) that has shoreline environments designated Conservancy and Natural that are now fully occupied with residential development – not the original intention! In other words, land use is a critical component of the I&C, along with ecological conditions.

Next the group moved onto the agenda topic of STAC Comments on the Draft I&C Report:

- John handed out an October 13th draft meeting summary from an October 11th meeting of 6 of the 15 STAC members. Background: STAC comments provided by 11 of the 15 committee members to staff had been compiled into one document (originally dated 10/5; revised 11/1) and the compilation was first distributed to STAC members by Email on 10/9. Between September 26th and October 10th, several members indicated an interest to meet to discuss the collection of comments prior to the 10/13 STAC & SPAC meeting. The late request for such a meeting, low initial response from committee members, and limited project resources did not allow staff to organize or lead a meeting. John offered to facilitate that meeting, and prepared the summary document. John reviewed the document and noted that items A, B, H, and I in the draft meeting summary were new since the 10/4/06 comment deadline.
- Jerry noted that he had not seen the STAC comment compilation. *Michelle responded that she just realized that she had not sent out the STAC comments to the SPAC and apologized for the oversight. Those comments will be provided to the SPAC.*
- Stephen noted that the Battelle and Ecology scoring will be helpful once completed
- Karen asked for an example of a “research, monitoring and adaptive management plan” – how do you do that?! *Richard responded that it might be addressed in conjunction with other programs and include monitoring status and trends. John added that it might expand on a San Juan County program.*
- Jerry noted that corrective action is key to any adaptive management plan.
- Richard noted that there are still a few data sources to work out but that things are pretty close.
- Margaret thanked the STAC for all their efforts to review and comment on the Draft I&C Report. She noted it was a considerable task and their time and expertise is appreciated by both County staff and her team. She estimated that about 90% of the 10/4 comments can be accommodated. Many of those comments received were met with her team’s response of agreement and intent to address. As for some of the 10/11 comments from the STAC sub-group, there may not be budget, time or purview available to address all suggestions/requests. As mentioned previously, the budget for the I&C Report is already overspent. For example, the idea of an adaptive management plan may have merit in the bigger picture of SMP updates, but is a concept better addressed at the State level. As a reminder, page 33 of the Guidelines (WAC 173-26) states that the characterization process consists of three steps and may be of a generalized nature. *Stephen added that this I&C is the “initial” characterization as part of an iterative process. Margaret added that the Battelle information is still coming and may address some of the STAC sub-group’s concerns.*
- Josh recounted the “how we got here” story of this SMP update process: The County applied to Ecology for legislative funds in order to “get in line” before King County, which is scheduled to update in the '07 – '09 biennium. The concern was that a large county with many incorporated cities might use up a majority of the funds available during the next biennium. We also wanted to make use of the '00 Draft SMP and the '05

Inventory work that had been funded by Ecology with Coastal Zone Management funds. Whatcom and Snohomish were other counties that were updating and would help provide an example to follow, more applicable than the example King County might offer. The initial budget estimates for our project looked good and while Adolfson bid higher, they were willing to pare down their proposed budget to fit our estimates. The City of Port Townsend SMP Update showed that the Restoration Plan component needed some improvement – more science and earlier in the project. We developed the idea to utilize the Battelle work on Bainbridge Island and Columbia River and the Ecology work that Stephen and colleague Susan Grigsby had done in order to make a “better, faster, stronger” Restoration Plan process and product. Adolfson has been very patient with the unforeseen delays that have resulted from this expanded partnership, and we at the County are partly responsible for some of the complexity and delays. We admit that cutting edge efforts such as these can be messy, and indeed this has been messy. We are going above and beyond what is required and we are over budget in some areas. But we believe this will all be for the best interest of the project and ask for our committees and the public to be patient with this innovative process. *Jeffree added that some members of the STAC and SPAC were involved in the Port Townsend project and the resulting restoration plan for a smaller jurisdiction provided an excellent foundation for the work now being done to strengthen quantitative evaluation methods in a similar but expanded effort for Jefferson County. These people’s experience is a great resource for this project.*

- John asked what’s next for the STAC. *Josh responded that given the level of interest indicated by some STAC members, further review and comment tasks await, including the Battelle work. Michelle clarified that when STAC members were solicited for participation, the request presented was for preliminary work during the “science compilation and analysis phase” then a more supportive role during the SPAC’s work to assist development of goals, policies, designations and regulations. We also planned for a minimum of STAC meetings, with most review and comment provided by email and phone. We don’t want to go back on our promise, but if individuals are interested to do more than originally planned, we’re happy to have the assistance and appreciate the time and energy given to the project.*
- John mentioned he couldn’t find bulkheading on the maps *Kent responded that Maps 11, 12 and 13 for Geomorphology and Modifications have bulkheads indicated in a pea green color. Josh added a comment about the history of the County’s GIS staffing and services.*
- Al noted that the STAC sub-group’s meeting summary says the Draft I&C Report is not enough, but wondered if the recommendations would also not be enough. *John responded that it’s hard to review without seeing Battelle’s work.*
- Al commented that from discussion it sounded like items A, B, C are ok, D is a major undertaking, and wonders if the additional comments would make for 5 more pages to the report or 500. *Richard made a comment about riparian function.*
- Al noted that maybe it would be worthwhile to try a practice scenario. *Richard wondered how to tell if there’s enough data for policy making and/or enough for management implementation. Josh suggested reviewing the goals and policies of the ’89 SMP and the ’00 Draft SMP.*
- Jerry noted that item B (improve organizational structure and framework of report) would be very useful, but asked if it could be done. *Margaret responded that she’d have to confer with her team. She further clarified that the SPAC will not be asked to develop goals and policies alone, using only the I&C Report, but that Adolfson and County staff will lead and support that process by presenting draft language for discussion and finalization. She noted that Whatcom County also used 2 committees – a technical group and a citizens group.*
- Josh noted that it is important to remember the difference between ShoreZone reaches, Study reaches and management reaches.
- John added that it’s useful to know how the SPAC will function and suggested referring to Peter Best’s experience in working with the City of Bainbridge Island and Battelle. John will work to finalize the STAC sub-group’s meeting summary document and provide to Michelle for distribution.

The Adolfsen team then continued the presentation with the topic of shoreline environment designations (SEDs):

- SEDs are based on ecological condition and existing land use and provide for allowable uses.
- '89 SMP has 5 – Aquatic, natural, Conservancy, Suburban and Urban. Currently, the overall breakdown is:
 - 86.97% Conservancy,
 - 6.4% Suburban and
 - 3.4% Natural with the rest in parallel designations.
- Parallel designations exist now and are possible in the update as well.
- Rivers and Lakes are currently all Conservancy.
- Marine shorelines breakdown is:
 - 64% Conservancy,
 - 18% Suburban,
 - 9% Natural,
 - 3% Urban, and the rest in parallel designations.
- Josh noted that there is no residential in Natural SED
- Jerry noted that in the '89 SMP, a Pit to Pier project is allowed in the Conservancy SED, while in the '00 Draft SMP it is not. SEDs must be defined. *Josh concurred that this update will identify, define and locate SEDs.*
- Larry suggested keeping a bigger perspective.
- John noted that there are different SED definitions between jurisdictions. *Margaret responded that the Guidelines define SEDs. Jerry suggested that the SPAC look closely at the SED section of the Guidelines for purpose, criteria and policies. Larry noted there are different “shades” of Natural (i.e. Kah Tai Lagoon).*
- Peter D. noted that we may need more SEDs than are recommended. *Margaret added that land use zoning also affects the story, not just SEDs alone. Kent added that there are 6 SEDs recommended in the Guidelines. It's ok to use more than that, but there is no direct conversion of terms. Margaret added that Whatcom County has 10 SEDs, mostly matched to zoning and land use but that also consider biological factors.*
- John asked how the SPAC might anticipate development requests for establishing SEDs. *Josh responded that we'll look at uses and sort to categories for allowed, conditional and prohibited uses and difference from the standard variances.*
- Peter D. noted that there is only one aquatic area now.
- Margaret noted that the SEDs and the use regulations combined determine the allowable uses.
- Josh noted that the designation goes landward from the mean lower low water mark (MLLW) and that Aquatic goes seaward from the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) so that there is overlap on the beach proper. Also, designations go from the top of the bluff back, not vertically along the bluff face. *In retrospect, this answer appears incorrect. There is no overlap at the land/water interface.*
- Next steps were identified as:
 - Complete the I&C Report
 - Begin work on SEDs, goals and policies
 - Restoration Plan

3:25 pm The presentation and discussion shifted to the next agenda topic of an Introduction to Restoration Planning:

- The Restoration Plan (RP) doesn't really get formally "adopted" as part of the SMP itself, but is a required step of the update process. Also, while the key components of the SMP will be legally incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan and Jefferson County Code, there will also likely exist a "convenience document" with all SMP components in one place for ease of use.
- The RP will consist of Adolfson's freshwater reach opportunities, Ecology's watershed scores, and Battelle's nearshore prioritization. These assessments occur at three different scales: ShoreZone, watershed, and drift cell scales respectively.
- Battelle's nearshore prioritization looks at ecological function controls and stressors. Ecology and Adolfson look at watershed processes to assess the process intensity, level of alteration and potential for restoration, basin by basin for various processes and identify goals and needs for restoration on the reach scale.
- This work is still in progress and work products will be circulated to committees in the near future.
- John offered to facilitate additional STAC meetings, but would need permission from his supervisor first to commit his time to such a task.
- STAC help is needed to identify and locate any additional data.
- More SPAC meetings will occur prior to the February charrette, and possibly one or more joint STAC and SPAC meetings too.
- Steve noted that there needs to be a balance between the I&C Report and the RP. There needs to be some easy quick fixes to support the SED development. *Margaret again expressed appreciation for the time and expertise STAC members have given the project.*
- Michelle echoed the appreciation for everyone's attendance, for the time and energy put into reviewing documents and preparing for committee meetings, and noted that after the conclusion of the 3-day Shoreline Charrette Primer, results and meeting notes will be compiled and distributed. Then another series of SPAC meetings will be scheduled.

4:10 pm Public Comment – Again, no member of the audience had signed up on the Public Comment Sign-up Sheet, but Michelle asked the audience if there was any public comment. One person spoke, first identifying himself falsely as "David Johnson – a combination of our two commissioners who attended last night" then identified himself as Mike Belenski, resident of Jefferson County. His spirited comments included the following [*staff response is included here for clarification as part of this document preparation*]:

- Minutes from the 8/31 and 9/26 SPAC meetings are not posted on the project webpage [*Meeting notes are made available as soon as they are compiled; notes for the dates mentioned are pending*]
- SPAC meetings have been held during the daytime and the average person can't attend without a burden. [*SPAC meetings have been scheduled during regular business hours due to the overwhelming request of committee members; committee members are meant to serve as a conduit for information and feedback by representing a variety of stakeholder interests in the event interested public are unable to attend*]
- Last night's slideshow didn't address the CAO sufficiently [*The CAO and SMP are separate processes governed by different legislation – Growth Management Act and Shoreline Management Act respectively – some issues of their interface are still being determined at the State and court levels*]
- Who told you that the STAC and SPAC aren't subject to the open public meetings act? [*The STAC and SPAC are formed by staff to assist the staff development phase of the SMP update. Staff has opted to keep the STAC and SPAC process open to the public in good faith and to foster greater community buy-in. Once an SMP staff proposal is submitted to the Planning Commission, the formal public review and comment process begins.*]
- On whose behalf are the committees giving public testimony? [*see above description; the committees are formed to provide direct advice to staff so that staff can prepare a preliminary document for formal public review.*]

- The webpage shows the STAC meetings every month of the project but there's been no meeting notices or minutes. *[The STAC & SPAC Roles, Responsibilities, Operations and Schedule document shows that STAC meetings were scheduled for June and October. Staff has convened only one STAC meeting, a joint meeting with the SPAC on June 2, prior to this October 13 joint meeting.]*
- There were too many pastries and not enough hand-outs at today's meeting *[Head counts for catering services had to be given in advance of the event – some leeway is to be expected. There was at least one copy of every handout still on the information table at the end of the meeting.]*
- In reviewing the list of committee members it's clear that this is political payback. Who was picked and why? *[A variety of stakeholder interests was identified and staff invited appropriate representatives to participate as they were available and willing to make the time commitment]*
- Anyone from the Department of Ecology involved in this can expect a request to review their personnel file to ensure they're qualified to do the job. *[Ecology personnel involved in the project are highly qualified, with years of professional experience and often renowned in their field of expertise]*
- Your agenda said public comment was at 4:45 today, somebody better be around in case anyone comes in at that time wanting to give public comment. *[Common sense dictates that agenda times may change without notice since some topics will take more or less discussion time than predicted.]*

4:20 pm The committees had completed their scheduled work session early and committee members were excused.

5:00 pm Staff saw no further interest in public comment and the meeting was adjourned.