

**JEFFERSON COUNTY  
STATE OF WASHINGTON**

**Adoption of Technical Supplements Prepared }  
In Support of the Shoreline Master Program }  
Comprehensive Update: }  
Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report; }  
Shoreline Restoration Plan; and }  
Cumulative Impacts Analysis }      **Resolution No.       -13****

**WHEREAS**, RCW Chapter 90.58, et seq., also known as the Shoreline Management Act (“SMA”), requires each city and county to develop and implement a local Shoreline Master Program (“SMP”); and

**WHEREAS**, Jefferson County adopted a joint Shoreline Management Master Program in 1974 with the City of Port Townsend. Subsequently, the Jefferson County SMP was amended in 1989, 1993, 1996, and 1998; and

**WHEREAS**, RCW Chapter 36.70A, et seq., also known as the Growth Management Act (“GMA”), requires that counties planning under the GMA adopt development regulations that are consistent with and implement their comprehensive plans; and

**WHEREAS**, the Unified Development Code (UDC) was originally adopted on December 18, 2000 as a development regulation required by the Growth Management Act, to be effective January 16, 2001; and

**WHEREAS**, for proper citation in courts of law the existing SMP has been codified within the Jefferson County Code (JCC) at Chapter 18.25; and

**WHEREAS**, Jefferson County utilized Coastal Zone Management (CZM) grant funding awarded from 2003 to 2005 to conduct a preliminary shoreline inventory and analysis, representing the first phase of the SMP update process, anticipated at the time to be completed in 2007. The preliminary shoreline inventory and analysis project was completed in summer 2005.

**WHEREAS**, in 2005 Jefferson County was awarded state Department of Ecology grant funds to complete a comprehensive update of the SMP, per the requirements of the SMP Guidelines (WAC 173-26, et seq.) and the SMA.

**WHEREAS**, the County’s Department of Community Development (DCD) procured professional services through contract agreements with ESA Adolfson (formerly Adolfson Associates Inc., later called ESA) in November 2005, and with Battelle Marine Sciences Laboratory in January 2006 to assist the project; and

**WHEREAS**, the DCD convened and worked extensively with two citizen/stakeholder groups, the Shoreline Technical Advisory Committee (“STAC”) and the Shoreline Policy Advisory Committee (“SPAC”), during the initial phase of project work from 2006 to 2008 to assist development of required scientific and technical analysis and documentation as well as new SMP goals, policies, environment designations, and use/development regulations. Some twenty-two (22) open public meetings were held with the two groups; and

**WHEREAS**, the advisory committees helped the County team of staff and consultants collaboratively prepare key supplemental documents to support preparation and implementation of an updated SMP; and

**WHEREAS**, this resolution is being considered concurrent with the proposed Comprehensive Plan (“CP”) and Unified Development Code (“UDC”) amendments for a comprehensive SMP update (MLA08-475); and

**WHEREAS**, the BoCC now approves this resolution as a complementary action to the final adoption of the updated SMP via local ordinance and makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law, organized into the following sections:

- Technical Analysis Overview
- Advisory Committees
- Supporting Analysis & Documents
- Public Review Opportunities

### **Technical Analysis Overview**

1. During 2006 – 2007, building on the 2005 preliminary inventory, the County further assessed the following:
  - landscape scale processes, such as hydrology, sediment transport, and water quality; and
  - their effects on shoreline ecological functions.

The purpose of this analysis was to:

- identify key areas (such as floodplains, wetlands, permeable deposits, etc.) that support these landscape processes;
- identify where key areas have been altered by development and other human activity; and
- to describe, reach-by-reach, the physical, biological and other attributes of fresh- and saltwater shorelines under SMP jurisdiction.

This analysis is documented in the *Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report* (November 2008).

2. Building on the findings of the Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report and incorporating additional work focused on watershed characterization and nearshore restoration prioritization, the *Final Shoreline Restoration Plan* (October 2008) was completed after nearly 2 years of collaborative development. The document serves as a technical supplement to the updated Shoreline Master Program (SMP). While the policies and regulations of the SMP protect shoreline resources from new adverse impacts, this Plan will help repair existing degraded and impaired areas to improve the baseline conditions of shoreline health over time by collaborating with community partners and willing landowners to implement the many recommended restoration actions.
3. In recognition that even allowed and preferred uses have effects on the very shoreline resources the SMP is intended to protect, the cumulative effects of the proposed policies and regulations were evaluated. For example, the development of an individual residence or appurtenant structure (e.g. garage) may not have a significant negative impact, but collectively all such allowed development under the updated SMP may likely result in environmental degradation. A key SMP-compliance hurdle is to ensure "no net loss of ecological function"; therefore it was important to analyze the collective effect of the proposed policies and regulations. This evaluation included review of current conditions, existing natural processes, anticipated future development, description of the effects of such development, summary of other programs that help protect shorelines, and how the updated SMP will achieve 'no net loss'. The *Cumulative Impacts Analysis* was drafted in 2007, revised in 2009 and finalized in 2010.

### **Advisory Committees**

4. In April 2006, DCD established two advisory committees to assist staff and consultants with the various phases and work products of the SMP update project.
5. DCD staff established a Shoreline Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to assist with the compilation and review of "the most current, accurate and complete scientific and technical information available" as per WAC 173-26-201. The STAC was comprised of approximately 14 individuals selected primarily for their professional expertise. Representatives from area tribes, state and federal natural resource agencies, and non-profit organizations that conduct shoreline restoration included an array of biologists (aquatic, fishery, habitat, and marine), ecologists, geologist, and project specialists. Five representatives had alternates to attend meetings in their stead if/when schedule conflicts arose. STAC members provided feedback remotely via written comments and directly by attending meetings.
6. DCD staff also established a Shoreline Policy Advisory Committee (SPAC) in 2006 to assist with the development of goals, policies, and regulations based on the preceding technical work.

7. The SPAC was comprised of approximately 26 members selected to represent various citizen, local and state government, and tribal stakeholder interests. Eleven representatives had alternates to attend meetings in their stead if/when schedule conflicts arose. SPAC members primarily provided input by attending meetings.
8. The core of the SPAC was 10 citizen representations including Aquaculture, Building Industry, Environment/Conservation, Marine Industry, Port Townsend Paper Corporation, Real Estate, Recreation & Public Access, a Recent Shoreline Permittee, Rural Agriculture, and a legacy member from the 2000 Citizen Advisory Group.
9. In addition, the SPAC included five local government representatives, from the Hood Canal Coordinating Council (staff), Jefferson County Conservation District, Jefferson County Marine Resources Committee, Jefferson County Planning Commission, and the Port of Port Townsend.
10. Five state government representations on the SPAC included state Departments of Ecology, Fish & Wildlife, Natural Resources, and Puget Sound Partnership (formerly Puget Sound Action Team).
11. Six tribal co-manager representative (staff) positions on the SPAC included the Hoh Tribe, Jamestown S’Klallam, Lower Elwha Klallam, Port Gamble S’Klallam, Quinault Nation, and Skokomish Tribe.
12. The STAC and SPAC were formed by, worked with, and were advisory only to the DCD team of staff and consultants in preparation of the amendment proposal MLA08-475. The groups were neither appointed by the BoCC nor formed as a committee of the Planning Commission. Both groups were chaired by staff with considerable consultant support/participation, functioned primarily by informal consensus rather than voting, and met as needed to review materials and provide feedback on draft work products. Between June 2006 and November 2008, the STAC met three (3) times exclusively, another five (5) times jointly with the SPAC, and the SPAC met another fourteen (14) times exclusively. All committee meetings were advertised and open to public attendance. Some of these meetings were focused on the scientific analysis work and technical supporting documents for the SMP.
13. On June 2, 2006, the STAC and SPAC met jointly for a project kick-off meeting, including overview of the SMA, SMP Guidelines, project schedule and committee roles/responsibilities.
14. On September 26, 2006, the SPAC met to conclude discussions on the Integration Strategy and begin an overview of shoreline inventory and characterization requirements and methodologies.

15. On October 13, 2006, as part of the three (3) day Shoreline Charrette Primer public participation event (described separately above), the STAC and SPAC met jointly to review and discuss the Draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report, and to begin an overview of restoration planning requirements and methodologies.
16. Also on December 14, 2006, the STAC met in the afternoon to discuss finalizing the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report (SICR).
17. On March 6, 2007, the STAC met to review SMP Guideline requirements, hear technical presentations on the watershed characterization and marine shore restoration prioritization efforts, and to discuss the synthesis of technical information in the SICR, Restoration Plan and updated SMP.
18. On November 6, 2007, the STAC met in the morning to review and discuss the Draft Shoreline Restoration Plan and proposed shoreline environment designation system.
19. On December 4, 2007, the STAC and SPAC met jointly to review and discuss the shoreline environment designation (SED) system and proposed geographic application along shorelines under SMP jurisdiction. Detailed review included comparison between proposed SEDs and aerial oblique photos of the marine shoreline to 'ground truth' the proposal accurately reflected area conditions.
20. On August 5, 2008 the STAC and SPAC met jointly to review and discuss the feedback received on the Revised Committee Working Draft SMP, the Draft Shoreline Restoration Plan, and the Final Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report.

## **Supporting Analysis & Documents**

21. **Shoreline Inventory** - DCD staff worked with ESA Adolfson (ESAA) and the Shoreline Technical Advisory Committee (STAC) to prepare the November 2008 Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report (FSICR), consistent with WAC 173-26-201. This report updates and replaces: the 2005 Shoreline Inventory & Analysis; the September 2006 STAC Draft Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report; the May 2007 Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report; and the June 2008 Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report.

22. By reviewing and synthesizing numerous scientific and technical sources of information, this report evaluates key ecosystem processes that drive the hydrological, sediment transport and water quality functions at the broad watershed scale to document how these processes in turn affect ecological functions and processes along SMP shorelines. The report also analyzes the existing shoreline conditions for discrete sections, or 'reaches', of the marine, stream/river, and lake areas under SMP jurisdiction to establish a current baseline and identify areas that are currently degraded. Documentation of current conditions is critical to achieving the 'no net loss' standard of the state SMP guidelines (WAC 173-26-186).
23. Overall, the shorelines of Jefferson County are in good condition compared to those of more urbanized jurisdictions in the Puget Sound region. However, there is evidence of considerable ecological damage in places, most of which could be reversed by restoration efforts, and places where intact ecological features demand protection and conservation to avoid further degradation or a net loss of ecological functions.
24. The state Department of Ecology (Ecology) provided technical support to the shoreline inventory and characterization work by conducting a detailed watershed characterization of east Jefferson County using a landscape analysis method. This characterization identifies areas (grouped by hydrogeologic units) that are most important to maintaining ecosystem functions, areas with human-caused alterations that degrade such functions, and which watershed sub-basins are best suited for protection, development and restoration based on the interplay of importance and degree of alteration. This watershed characterization is appended to the October 2008 Final Shoreline Restoration Plan (FSRP) and the results are also incorporated into the restoration planning components of the updated SMP update.
25. Battelle Marine Sciences Laboratory (Battelle) conducted a detailed marine nearshore analysis and prioritization for east Jefferson County. This effort was targeted to support the shoreline restoration planning aspect of the SMP update project, but also provided useful information for the FSICR (see above). Similar to the Ecology watershed characterization, Battelle identified the relative level of shoreline ecological function and stressors to those functions by scoring numerous controlling factors in order to identify and prioritize the relative potential for successful restoration and conservation efforts. This nearshore analysis and prioritization is appended to the FSRP.
26. Physical parameters such as wave energy, light availability, substrate type and supply, water quality, and upland watershed condition were controlling factors considered in preparing the FSICR. Human use/development such as roads, shore armoring, docks, beach stairs, marinas, septic systems, and dikes were stressors considered in generating the report.
27. **Shoreline Restoration** - DCD also worked with ESAA, the STAC and the SPAC

to prepare the October 2008 Final Shoreline Restoration Plan (FSRP), consistent with WAC 173-26-201. This report builds on the FSICR by providing a planning framework for where and how degraded shoreline ecological functions can be restored in Jefferson County.

28. The FSRP establishes Jefferson County's restoration vision and goals, identifies priority areas for freshwater and marine nearshore restoration and protection, and recommends specific restoration actions by reach area along with an overview of project implementation steps, anticipated technical/logistical considerations (cost, time, and difficulty), potential partner organizations and funding sources.
29. The FSRP supports the planning and regulatory roles of the SMP and is intended to serve as a tool for the County, private landowners, government agencies, non-profit organizations and the public to collectively improve shoreline conditions over time. Such restoration efforts are understood to help achieve the 'no net loss' standard of the state SMP guidelines (WAC 173-26-186).
30. Overall, the FSRP concludes Jefferson County shorelines have areas where functions have been impaired. Ecosystem processes and values need to be improved, the quality of habitat for salmon, shellfish, forage fish and other sensitive and/or locally-important species needs to be increased, restoration efforts need to be integrated with capital projects and resource management efforts, and cooperation actions need to involve local, state, federal, tribal, non-governmental organizations, and landowner partners.
31. **Cumulative Impacts** - In February 2009, DCD staff and consultants prepared the Draft Cumulative Impacts Analysis (Draft CIA) to assess the total collective effects the goals, policies, shoreline designations, and regulations proposed in the 12/3/08 PDSMP would have on the shorelines have if all allowed use and development occurred. The assessment is limited to cumulative impacts of reasonable foreseeable future development in areas subject to SMA jurisdiction. This report updated and replaced the June 2007 Draft Cumulative Impacts Analysis.
32. In July 2009, DCD staff prepared supplemental data regarding vacant, non-conforming lots to augment the Draft CIA and assist Planning Commission deliberations.
33. In February 2010, the CIA was finalized by the ESA consultant team to incorporate the supplemental data and reflect the provisions contained in the Locally Adopted SMP, then submitted to Ecology for review and approval as a required step of the SMP Update process. Ecology accepted the CIA as consistent with the requirements of WAC 173-26.

### **Public Review Opportunities**

34. Exceeding the requirements in RCW 36.70A.140, RCW 90.58.130 and WAC 173-26-201, the County put extraordinary effort into informing and engaging

stakeholders and the general public in the SMP update project. The actions taken to invite and actively encourage people, groups, entities, agencies and tribes to participate were started early and made often throughout the multi-year process.

35. Feedback and informal comment received was considered in development of technical analyses and amendment proposal. The efforts are further described below and documented on the project webpage at <http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/ShorelinePublicOutreach.htm>
36. On March 12 – 15, 2007, DCD staff and consultants, Ecology staff, and advisory committee volunteers conducted a series of evening SMP Road Show public outreach events at four (4) locations across Jefferson County including Chimacum, Port Ludlow, Brinnon, and Clearwater. Each event followed the same agenda, including an open house with informational displays, a slideshow presentation with project overview and introduction to findings of the Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report (SICR); described separately below), and an audience participation exercise to gather local knowledge about shoreline restoration efforts and opportunities. DCD staff, consultants and committee volunteers were available to answer questions. Public participation in the events totaled nearly 130.
37. Iterative versions of the cumulative impacts analysis document were available to the public on the project website, including:
  - Draft Cumulative Impacts Analysis - June 2007
  - Draft Cumulative Impacts Analysis - February 2009
  - Supplemental data on vacant, non-conforming lots along marine shores - July '09
  - Cumulative Impacts Analysis (Final) – February 2010
38. The STAC primarily reviewed and provided input on the inventory & characterization and restoration planning work and documents. Because the technical information was intended to inform the goals, policies, and regulations of the SMP, the SPAC also had opportunity to review and provide comments on draft documents. The groups met jointly on October 13, 2006, December 4, 2007, and August 8, 2008 to review and discuss technical work products; all meetings were open to the public.
39. When iterative versions of the technical document were provided to the committees they also became available to the public for informal review and feedback online via the project website, public review copy or hard copy/CD for purchase at the DCD office, and/or County Library/Bookmobile, including:

SICR:

- September 2006 STAC Review Draft
- February 2007 STAC Draft

- May 2007 STAC Draft
- November 2007 Draft Recommended SED Maps
- June 2008 Final ICR
- November 2008 FSICR

SRP:

- October 2007 Draft
- June 2008 Revised Draft
- October 2008 FSRP

40. On June 26, 28, July 1, 2 and 3, 2008, DCD staff and consultants conducted twelve (12) Neighborhood Information Booths at locations across east Jefferson County including Port Ludlow, Brinnon, Quilcene, Gardiner, Discovery Bay, North Beach, Cape George, Port Townsend, Shine, Coyle, Nordland, and Port Hadlock. The intent was to inform citizens about the SMP update project, invite participation by providing informal comment on key documents – the SICR, Shoreline Restoration Plan, and a Committee Working Draft SMP, and encourage attendance at an upcoming Community Planning Workshop.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Board of County Commissioners for Jefferson County, Washington, in regular session assembled does hereby resolve as follows:

1. **Adoption of SMP Supporting Documents** -The County Commission adopts the following as technical supplements prepared in support of the adoption and implementation of the updated SMP:
  - a. Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report (November 2008)
  - b. Final Shoreline Restoration Plan (October 2008)
  - c. Cumulative Impacts Analysis (February 2010)
2. **Utilization of SMP Supporting Documents** - These documents provide the scientific and technical foundation for the goals, policies, shoreline designations, and regulations of the updated SMP. They are reference materials to be utilized by permit applicants, development professionals, community organizations, and regulatory agency staff during the implementation of the SMP at both the project- and programmatic levels.
3. DCD staff may refer to these documents as sources of technical information during customer coaching, pre-application conferences, permit intake, consistency review, determination of permit conditions, post-issuance technical support, and as otherwise appropriate for the purpose of ensuring the intent of the SMA and SMP Guidelines is met locally. Other agencies and organizations are urged to consider these documents as part of their operations, strive for consistency between similar and related

documents, and to assist the County to collect up-to-date information as it becomes available.

4. **Attachments** – (Note: The lettering of the exhibits listed below is intended to be contiguous with the lettering of attachments to the SMP adopting ordinance, being considered concurrently with this resolution.)

**Exhibit E**      November 2008 Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report

**Exhibit F**      October 2008 Final Shoreline Restoration Plan

**Exhibit G**      February 2010 Cumulative Impacts Analysis

5. **Effective Date** - This resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately.

**Approved and signed this \_\_\_\_ day of December, 2013.**

JEFFERSON COUNTY  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

---

John Austin, Chairman

Seal:

Attest:

---

Phil Johnson, Member

---

Erin Lundgren  
Clerk of the Board

---

David Sullivan, Member

Approved as to Form Only:

---

David Alvarez  
Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

**List of Exhibits**

<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Provided</b>
<b>E</b>	November 2008 Final Shoreline Inventory & Characterization Report	Attached in digital format (CD); Also posted online
<b>F</b>	October 2008 Final Shoreline Restoration Plan	Attached in digital format (CD); Also posted online
<b>G</b>	February 2010 Cumulative Impacts Analysis	Attached in digital format (CD); Also posted online