

Shoreline Charrette Primer

October 12 – 14, 2006 · Inn at Port Hadlock

Thursday 10/12/06 - Public Meeting & Visioning Workshop 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. Additional County staff including Brent Butler, Rachel McHugh, Stacie Hoskins, Barbara Nightingale, Donna Frosthalm, David Johnson, Tami Pokorny, Dana Fickeisen (14)

Electeds & Advisors – David Sullivan, Phil Johnson, Bill Miller, Henry Werch, Bud Schindler, Peter Downey, Hans Daubenberger, David Roberts, Dick Broders, Al Bergstein, Marty Ereth, Karen Best, Jim Donaldson, Steve Todd, Rick Mraz, John Cambalik (16)

Audience – Over 50 members of the public attended, of which 32 signed the attendance sheet

Materials: *Required* - Final agenda dated 10-11-06;
Optional/For Information Only – 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”;

6:00 pm SMP Update Project Coordinator Michelle McConnell with Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD) welcomed the audience and opened the first session of the Shoreline Charrette Primer. She explained that the 3-day event was part of the early process to update the Jefferson County Shoreline Master Program and intended to inform and engage the public and other stakeholders about the shoreline planning project. She thanked Commissioner Sullivan and Commissioner Johnson, members of the Planning Commission, County staff from DCD and Environmental Health, and members of the Shoreline Technical and Shoreline Policy Advisory Committees for attending. She acknowledged and thanked the Washington Department of Ecology and Washington Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development for project and event funding support. She introduced fellow DCD staff, Brent Butler who introduced the keynote speaker, Dr. Edward Miles. Brent noted that Dr. Miles is the former director of the University of Washington School of Marine Affairs in the College of Ocean and Fishery Sciences, is currently the Virginia & Prentice Bloedel Professor of Marine Studies and Public Affairs, a Senior Fellow for the Joint Institute for the Study of Atmosphere and Oceans, a member of the Science Advisory Panel for the US Commission on Ocean Policy, and a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

6:05 pm Dr. Miles delivered a narrated slideshow presentation titled *Climate Change and the Pacific Northwest* then answered a few questions after his presentation. One key quote from Dr. Miles is that “Regional hydrology is the regulator of the [climate change] impacts we experience. Water is a big deal!” He also noted that more flooding and more droughts can be anticipated in the region. This slideshow presentation will be posted to the project webpage.

6:55 pm Michelle introduced staff members present with the lead consultant team, ESA Adolfson, including Kent Hale, Shannon Bartkiw, Gabrielle LaRoche and Project Manager Margaret Clancy. Margaret gave the next presentation titled *Shorelines 101: A Jefferson County Overview* then answered a few questions from the audience. This slideshow presentation will be posted to the project webpage.

8:00 pm DCD Lead Planner Josh Peters announced that there would be a short 10 minute break prior to the public visioning session, and Michelle made a few announcements about the availability of project handouts and related background information, the project webpage, the remaining two days of the 3-day Shoreline Charrette Primer event, the upcoming Watershed Day VIII at Fort Worden offered by WSU Water Watchers, and the upcoming Shoreline Charrette in February 2007.

8:15 pm Josh reconvened the group, described the intent of the public visioning process and outlined the first exercise. Participants were asked to join one of the following break-out discussion groups:

- Residential Uses/Vegetation Conservation
- Commercial & Industrial Uses
- Public Access & Recreation/Aesthetics & Views
- Environmental Protection “No Net Loss”/Shoreline Restoration

Once in a discussion group, participants were asked to brainstorm on what they valued/liked/wanted to keep or increase about shoreline uses related to their group topic, and what they were concerned about/disliked/wanted to change or decrease. Everyone was invited to write down individual ideas on separate index cards, and pass them to the group facilitator(s). All the individual idea cards were taped to the wall, and the facilitators worked with each group to read each card aloud, confirm/clarify the meaning, combine duplicates or similar/related ideas and compile all the individual ideas into main value and concern statements on full-page sheets posted on the wall in place of the index cards. Once this process was complete, each person got three sticky dots to “vote” for the value and concern statements they agreed with most at their discussion group station. Then participants were asked to rotate to the other stations, and three sticky dots were given to each person at each station for similar prioritization. The sticky dots were color coded for each station to minimize “dot hoarding”.

After participants had exercised their “dot-mocracy” around the room, a spokesperson from each group gave a quick verbal summary of the collective “votes”. The results of this exercise are described below.

Residential Uses/Vegetation Conservation

Individual ideas on index cards were compiled into the following main value and concern statements (number of sticky dot “votes” noted in parentheses):

- Shellfish: How to improve, keep shellfish beds (17)
- What can be done in the buffer/setback? Bank stability; erosion; native vegetation; protect land; water quality (fertilizers/pollutants); view maintenance; what vegetation should be conserved (13)
- Sewage disposal: Funding for community drainfields when multiple home sites/residences exist and old septic systems (8)
- Setbacks: How close can I build? (4)
- Beach access/stairs: How many can we accommodate? (4)
- Boathouses/Docks/Buoys: How many can we accommodate? Living or staying on boats (3)
- Bank protection/integrity: Bulkheads to protect eroding shore; existing erosion (1)
- Existing Structures: What rights are vested? Remodels/teardowns (0)*
- Eagles: Affecting buildability of lots; other priority species (0)*

Commercial & Industrial Uses

Individual ideas on index cards were compiled into the following main value and concern statements (number of sticky dot “votes” noted in parentheses):

- Preserve and encourage shellfish/aquaculture industry and its inherent needs (water quality) (14)
- Limit shoreline armoring and recognize its ecosystem effects (net-shore drift impacts) (10)
- Maintenance and improvement of water quality and habitat (10)
- Maintain a working waterfront, acknowledging traditional uses on shoreline of county (6)
- Promote alternatives to traditional septic design (i.e. composting toilets) (5)
- Explore ways to beneficially use “waste” byproducts (3)
- Provide tax incentives or other incentives to “reward” development uses that have environmental benefits (1)
- Encourage public access where appropriate (e.g. on-site for commercial development; off-site for industrial) (0)*

Public Access & Recreation/Aesthetics & Views

Individual ideas on index cards were compiled into the following main value and concern statements (number of sticky dot “votes” noted in parentheses):

- Consider shoreline banks as a critical area (14)
- Water quality of nearshore environment on shellfish (12)
- Increase signage and education at public access locations (7)
- Monitoring and enforcement of existing shoreland/shoreline regulations (include tree removal) (7)
- Complexity of private/public land ownership and effect on private property landowners rights and access (6)
- Bank erosion impacting existing structures (4)
- Design standards for shoreline structures (avoid “jarring” views) (3)
- Noise impacts on recreation and aesthetics (2)
- Maintain views to water from public lands (1)
- Beach access from private residential property (1)

Environmental Protection “No Net Loss”/Shoreline Restoration

Individual ideas on index cards were compiled into the following main value and concern statements (number of sticky dot “votes” noted in parentheses):

- Reduce bulkheads and hard armoring (use “soft” protection) (13)
- Maintaining shoreline vegetation (9)
- Reduce nutrient and pollution loading (8)
- Support native rather than non-native vegetation (7)
- Protect wildlife habitat – birds, shellfish, flora & fauna (6)
- Maintain viable commercial shellfish (6)
- Increase “natural” designation (4)
- Natural functioning ecosystems (4)
- Limit free-running dogs (3)
- Funding for mitigation (2)
- Clear designations for development and access (0)*
- Improve shore buffers – increase setbacks (larger and natural) (0)*

*NOTE: Statements with zero sticker dot “votes” would indicate that at least one person expressed the value/concern in the initial brainstorming phase of the exercise.

9:20 pm Josh reminded the audience that we are opting to update our SMP ahead of the state mandated deadline of 2011, and the law requires an update every 7 years thereafter. That means that 2018 is the next time

an SMP Update will be due. Michelle explained the final public visioning exercise was designed to assess what the public wants to see more of and less of in the years between now and the 2018 SMP update. She passed out a comment card that participants could fill out and submit on-site or take home and return by 10/31/06. The card asked for thoughts and ideas in answer to the following questions:

- Thinking ahead to the year 2018, what types of uses/developments would you like to see along the shoreline and where?
- Are there areas that you think should *not* be used/developed or where certain types of uses/developments should be discouraged or prohibited?

Only 5 comment cards were returned**, from which the following input was gathered:

- ID key areas that represent intact functioning ecological systems (e.g. drift cell, forage fish spawning beach, estuarine rearing area, shellfish habitat zone) and install educational signage to inform the public about them and increase public recreational access to them via kayaks/canoes through additional launch sites from public lands.
- Restore Olele Point wetlands/estuary area by levee/bulkhead removal
- Add incentive and policies to encourage shared private access structures/docks
- Consider assessing a “view corridor” fee as mitigation for vegetation removal and use it to fund re-vegetation program/projects.
- Upgrade shoreline residential sewage treatment systems – through LID, groundwater protection districts, or other means (utility districts) to protect and improve water quality.
- Fund shellfish districts to promote publicly owned shellfish areas – guild more sense of “ownership”.
- Cluster and LID developments on secondary sewer lines with protection/maintenance of critical habitat
- Prohibition of bulkheading for new land use based on reasonable use exemption
- A systemic approach to managing and acknowledging landscape scale impacts on riparian – bay - nearshore habitat
- Discouragement of certain types of development
- Protection of all functioning remnant pocket estuaries and estuaries
- Discourage clearing commercial timber and private residential adjacent to steep bluffs.
- Designate feeder bluffs as critical areas
- I envision greater public access so that many more can enjoy what could otherwise be restricted to the more affluent, however, those who can afford views & location should not have that undermined.
- Increase “natural” area designations.
- Personally, I would like to see environmentally friendly activities, such as shellfish aquaculture, eco-tourism, habitat restoration projects, etc long the shoreline wherever feasible and practical.
- I also would like to see hard armoring limited to commercial ports and pre-existing industrial properties only.
- Uses and developments I believe should be discouraged and/or prohibited are any activities which represent a net take from the system (i.e. armoring reduces the amount of solids available to drift cells therefore they result in a take and should be prohibited).

**Some comment cards were submitted the night of the public meeting, others were returned by mail.

9:25 pm Josh and Michelle again thanked the audience for attending, reminded them of the next two days of the Shoreline Charrette Primer, and the session was adjourned.