

*Jefferson County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update*  
**Shoreline Technical Advisory Committee (STAC)**

**11-6-07 Meeting Notes**

**Location:** Jefferson County Library, Port Hadlock

**Attendees:** *Committee Members* – Michael Adams, Richard Brocksmitth, John Cambalik, Margie Schirato, Jill Silver, Stephen Stanley, Jeffree Stewart, Steve Todd; (8)  
*Alternates* – (0)

*Staff & Consultants* - Michelle McConnell, Margaret Clancy; (2)

*Audience* – General Public (Gwen Lundgren, Connie Ross, Ed Edwards) attended & signed-in; (3)

**Materials:** *Required* - Final Agenda; Table 2. Draft Recommended SEDs handout; Nearshore SED Worksheet handout;

**8:15 am Welcome & Introductions** - Department of Community Development Associate Planner Michelle McConnell opened the meeting with welcoming remarks. She apologized for the late start that was due to the building just being opened at 8am when meeting room set-up occurred as quickly as possible. The group introduced themselves beginning with ESA Adolphson Senior Project Manager Margaret Clancy. Margaret then reviewed the meeting purpose and goals.

**8:23 am Observer Comment** – One member of the audience stated that as Beckett Point homeowners and residents, their group is keenly interested in issues of beach erosion, bulkheads and shoreline restoration opportunities and expressed appreciation for the opportunity to attend and learn.

**8:24 am Project Update** – Margaret reviewed key activities and accomplishments that have occurred since the last time the group met in March 2007:

- Prepared *Initial Review Draft SMP (IRD-SMP)* – April 2007
- Prepared *Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report- STAC Draft (I&C)* – May 2007
- Draft *Cumulative Impacts Analysis* template based on *IRD-SMP* – June 2007
- Led an internal staff review of *IRD-SMP* - Spring & Summer 2007
- Prepared *Committee Working Draft SMP (CWD-SMP)* – September 2007
- Leading *CWD-SMP* review with SPAC – September through December 2007
- Prepared *Draft Shoreline Restoration Plan* – November 2007
- Public outreach highlights included:
  - SMP Road Show in March '07
  - SMP Open Houses in October '07

Michelle noted that key project documents are available at the DCD Front Desk and Jefferson County Library. Two suggestions were given:

- Hard copy documents should also be provided at a West End location due to slow internet connections.
- Add a note on the project website that document copies can be purchased as hard copy or compact disc.

Margaret explained that some final revisions are pending for the I&C to include the new/missing rivers and lakes. Additional STAC input is welcome and a new deadline will be identified. Margaret may be able to provide a record of how previous STAC comments have been addressed.

**8:40 am      *Draft Shoreline Restoration Plan – Presentation & Discussion***

Margaret presented the DSRP and the following comments were made:

- WAC requirements are not extensive nor highly definitive
- Introduction should be clarified to link to protection/do no harm as primary since it isn't mentioned
- Ecology's watershed characterization/scoring addressed protection
- Review City of Port Townsend SMP for sample of readability
- DSRP is a technical appendix to the SMP not part of the Program that will be directly adopted (i.e. Whatcom Co. adopted their SRP by resolution.
- Puget Sound Partnership wants "action oriented" plans, this plan is not
- Water quality monitoring is needed at Site 48 in Discovery Bay
- WAC doesn't address integration of various efforts/opportunities nor where to find funding
- Mitigation is included as permit requirement, restoration is not required
- Consider case law on nexus & proportionality
- County should consider levying a tax on environmental degradation/impacts as a "take" from the public resources, and offer incentives for BMPs
- The SPAC may discuss incentives, but new taxes may not be feasible as part of the SMP
- Review City of Port Townsend SMP for mitigation and incentives.
- City has formed an *ad hoc* committee to look into Indian Point
- Project mitigation is implemented by the County project-by-project, but not tracked/monitored over time
- Look at how SMP and draft CAO fit together and what gaps need filling
- The Planning Commission draft CAO has:
  - 3 year monitoring requirement;
  - data output is not as useful at the parcel level;
  - is not landowner funded
  - All natural resource data is in one place
  - Needs current conditions monitoring implemented as required by GMA
- Other jurisdictions require applicant to post a bond @ 125% the project cost

**9:10 am**

- DSRP is a combination of the Ecology work, Battelle's work, and the I&C.
- Results of these varied analyses are not always in full agreement (i.e. Taylor Creek, Dosewallips, Taboo)
- DSRP does not analyze the findings of each of these data sources
- Look at City of Port Townsend SMP Table 14.6 – 1 Restoration Goals & Objectives and Table 14.7 – 1 Restoration Opportunities
- Form a sub-group from multiple efforts to coordinate strategies, techniques, BMPs etc. and how to capture "low hanging fruit"
- Avoid repeating/redundancy of other plans
- DSRP takes county-wide approach to restoration planning even though SMP jurisdiction is ~200'
- Who is primary and secondary audiences for DSRP – design and write the document for users
- Also include BMPs in SMP, not just DSRP

- Pilot funding has been sought for a Watershed & Stewardship Center linked to DCD to support the permit process. Sam Gibboney has been contracted. DCD only has 5 information sheets on resources and processes
- Look at City of Port Townsend SMP for strategies and demonstration projects

**9:27 am**

- How does DSRP compare with early Port Townsend product/process? Tracks from vision → goals & objectives → strategy
- Make sure DSRP is linked to CWD-SMP via Restoration vision, goals & policies
- Mimic City of Port Townsend's table of prioritized actions
- Further comparison of Ecology and Battelle results → why are there discrepancies; can they be reconciled; balance between academic analysis and real world (recent photos & ground truthing)
- Citizen goal – keep agricultural lands operational while minimizing negative effects on fish and shellfish
- Definition of “restoration” goes to historic conditions for Shorelines of Statewide Significance? Keep consistent with RCW definitions
- Hood Head is omitted and shouldn't be. Five pages of input have been provided on salmon, forage fish, birds, mammals, etc. Battelle function and stressor scores may be off.
- WRIA 16 Walter Creek needs protection – can we exceed the WAC>
- Thorndyke Creek has mining issues, needs more protection, be more explicit
- Partner group information needs updating
- Timeline for DSRP comments, revision, final review is pending; be sure to mesh with SMP.
- Likely reconvene after mid-January SPAC review of revised CWD-SMP.
- STAC may need 4 hours for final Restoration Plan and 4 hours of restoration policies & regulations
- Also planning phone interviews with key partner groups to ask their priorities (including ShoreStewards)
- Need more public education & outreach
- Is there interest in providing more public access? Some sites are not appropriate (i.e. Point Hannon's cuspid spit)

**10:15 am Break**

**10:30 am Reconvene**

**SED Menu & Locations** – Two handouts were provided to support the discussion: 1) Table 2.

Draft Recommended SEDs showing purpose, criteria and implications and 2) Nearshore SED Worksheet showing factors considered and GIS changes as revised. Margaret led the discussion and the following comments were made:

- “Public Conservancy” SED was dropped
- Existing SMP has only a few setbacks established by SED, proposed has uniform buffers by water body type
- Reminder: buffers protect natural functions setbacks are for construction
- Citizens want more land acquisition. Keep Public Conservancy.
- Look at CAO – RSP provisions; can buffers be public easements?
- What about buffer reductions and buffer averaging?
- If Public Conservancy used, would SED change when land ownership changes? Would that require frequent/ongoing Comprehensive Plan amendments?
- Look at how other jurisdictions deal with notices of title/deed, conservation easements, other mechanisms
- SED Allowed Uses – some discussion still pending with SPAC (Aquaculture, Moorage, “Hi – Med – Lo Intensity”)

*Jefferson County SMP Update – 11/6/07 STAC Meeting Notes*

- Should all rivers be Conservancy? → EJC river deltas should be Natural
- WAC definition of Conservancy says to include resource lands
- Natural SED requires conditional use permit (CUP)
- Harvesting trees for conversion to single family residential not covered under Forest Practices Act
- Use Highway 101 as the break between Natural and Conservancy SEDs?

**11:00 am**

- Duckabush River – Natural from mouth to Olympic Canal Tracts park
- Channel migration zone (CMZ) overlays are useful to target property buy-outs to reduce risk
- Ordinary high water mark (OHWM) is not mapped, but approximated. Site visit required case-by-case
- SMP revisions/amendments can occur between 7-year required program updates
- SMP revisions would be needed to reflect acquired lands? Not a recommended process but rather keep record for inclusion in the next update
- Restoration should be allowed in all SEDs
- More prohibited uses in Natural, no variances, no CUP
- Remember the human health and safety issues as much as the natural resource protection aspects
- Think about “grandfathered” uses in CMZs – discourage new or expanded and encourage removal
- Non-conforming use provisions are not by SEDs
- Draft CAO now includes CMZs as geological hazard
- Natural/Conservancy better where SFR in the CMZ to limit further impacts or risk.
- East County is different from West County re: subdividing lands
- Can we tell how many lots are within the CMZs or below OHWM?
- What about climate change impacts?
- New SEDs are much more protective than the existing system
- Think about the public fear factor and take more action sooner to inform
- What are the goals or aims of more/less protections?
- Tough to split Conservancy and Shoreline Residential
- Hood Head should change to Conservancy
- Glen Cove to Old Fort Townsend should be...
- Trust for Public Land is buying 4,000’ of shoreline and donating to WA State Parks between Port Townsend Paper Mill and Old Fort Townsend
- The shoreline oblique photos are useful for locating feeder bluffs

**11:53 am**

- SED maps are the latest version, revised from the May 2007 I&C
- Look more at the CMZ overlay, subdivision issue, high risk areas, some case-studies to consider development scenarios
- Talk more about landowner incentives

**11:55 am Meeting Wrap-up and Prep for next meeting**

- STAC comments about DSRP due via Comment Matrix Form due by December 21<sup>st</sup>
- Watch for emails about scheduling future meeting(s)

**12:03 pm Adjourn**