PLANNING COMMISSION
COMMISSIONER’S HEARING ROOM, COUPEVILLE, WA
TUESDAY JANUARY 24, 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Members Present</th>
<th>Members Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>Val Hillers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean Enell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Joselyn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>Mitchell Howard - Chair</td>
<td>Anna-Marie Sibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Leal Dickson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>Wayne Havens – 2nd Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>William Lippens – Vice Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Yonkman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chair Enell

ROLL CALL
Wayne Haven, Scott Yonkman, Mitchell Howard, Dean Enell, Mike Joselyn, Val Hillers, Bill Lippens

Planning staff present: Robert Pederson – Director, Karen Stewart – Shoreline Master Program Planner/Coordinator.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES
November 22, 2011

Commissioner Yonkman moved to approve the minutes as presented, Commissioner Howard seconded, motion carried unanimously.

ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC
None

DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Pederson announced that Leal Dickson was appointed by the Board of Island County Commissioners to fill an expired term in District 2. He is out of town with a prior commitment for this meeting, but will be at the Joint Meeting on February 13th.

Training for new Historical Preservation Commission (HPC) is underway. This Thursday they will be electing their officers. The parties are trying to be flexible about the new process and for the first year even those decisions which will be made administratively will be brought to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).
On the appeal of CPA 155/04, Oak Harbor UGA the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board rejected all 16 of the City’s claims. The City filed an appeal of that decision to Thurston County Superior Court. A hearings schedule has not yet been set.

The Board did not take action to opt in to the voluntary stewardship program under ESHB 1886 also known as the Ruckelshaus Center process. The County will proceed forward to defend the ordinance that regulates agricultural activities in respect to critical areas.

Karen Stewart will be talking about the Shoreline Master Program Update today and will be very involved with the Planning Commission as needed during this process.

**NEW BUSINESS – Election of Officers**

Chair Enell asked for nominations for the 2012 Officers.

**Chair:**

*Commissioner Joselyn nominated Mr. Havens, Commissioner Howard seconded the motion.*

*Commissioner Enell then nominated Commissioner Howard and Commissioner Lippens seconded motion.*

Director Pederson suggested since there were two motions on the floor to have a show of hands for the nominees. Three votes for Commissioner Havens, Four votes for Commissioner Howard.

**Vice Chair:**

*Commissioner Hillers nominated Commissioner Havens for Vice Chair, Commissioner Havens declined.*

*Commissioner Howard nominated Commissioner Yonkman, Commissioner Yonkman also declined.*

*Commissioner Enell nominated Commissioner Lippens, Commissioner Hillers seconded.* Commissioner Lippens advised he may be moving to San Francisco for a job opportunity.

Commissioner Havens stated he would be willing to take the Vice Chair in the event Commissioner Lippens takes the position in San Francisco.

*Commissioner Enell amended his motion to nominate Commissioner Lippens as Vice Chair, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

The motion was then revised to include Commissioner Havens as second Vice Chair to cover any occasion where the Chair and Vice Chair are both unable to attend, with the second Vice Chair moving up to Vice Chair should it be necessary.

*The amended motion then carried unanimously.*
NEW BUSINESS - Workshop

Workshop related to the Shoreline Master Program Update, a presentation on the Draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report and discussion of draft preliminary shoreline environment designations.

SMP Coordinator Karen Stewart advised all of today’s materials with the exception of the PowerPoint presentation are currently on the County Planning Department WebPages.

As the process gets further down the line, the strike out and underline copy the Commission typically sees will be made available. Deliberations and recommendations to the Board of Commissioners are expected to occur in August of this year.

Island County SMP

Presentation of Key Data and Issues from Shoreline Inventory

Review Shoreline Environment Designations Maps

Existing

Proposed

Shoreline Use Matrix
SMP Preparation Process

The State Department of Ecology review reminds us that this is a State program. In order for it to be effective it must be approved by the State.

**Conduct Inventory and Analysis** – August 2011 document. Inventory and characterization study is a key document; it provides a baseline for planning and measuring ecological conditions.

**Designate Environments and Frame Goals and Policies**
Shoreline Environment Designation (SED), this is basically zoning in the shoreline and discusses the different permit types, such as Shoreline Substantial Development permits, Shoreline Conditional Use permits, Shoreline Variances and how those would be applied to various uses and modifications within shoreline jurisdiction. There are also applications that are exempt from the Shoreline Substantial Development permits.

The process will answer questions such as what uses should be prohibited along the shoreline and what kind of site specific conditions will be needed in order to make a proposal compatible with adjacent uses and minimize environmental impacts.
**Draft SMP**
This begins discussing proposed goals and policies, this will look much like the other elements in the Comprehensive Plan and in fact, the goals and policies of the Shoreline Master Program are technically the fourteenth element of the Comprehensive Plan.

It does however get a bit complicated because it is not just under the Growth Management Act (GMA) it is under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). A draft of the goals and policies are scheduled to come to the Planning Commission in March.

Over the last few months a series of public workshops on some of the key shoreline issues, (beach public access, residential development, and slope stabilization) have been held in the community. Meetings have been held to gather input to better inform our policy writing. They will be drafted consistent with the input, policies, and State guidelines. Then the actual regulations and development standards will be worked on and are expected to come to the Planning Commission by May at the latest.

**Conduct the Cumulative Impact Analysis**
This will be ready in early June. This is one of the feedback loops. There is the goals and policies, the regulations, then the cumulative impact analysis is prepared and it feeds back in as they begin testing the proposed regulatory scheme to see if it meets the requirement of *No Net Loss* of ecological function. It is shared with the experts at the Department of Ecology (DOE) to make sure we are within the guidelines. Things may need to be adjusted after that analysis.

Commissioner Lippens wanted to know why the impact analysis is after the review.

Ms. Stewart replied that there needs to be an initial discussion and review so time is not spent on a cumulative impact analysis of regulations that aren’t really what the local jurisdiction wants.

Director Pederson added that under State standard there is no net loss. The discussion of policy gets lost when trying to drill down on the particulars of the regulations. You want to evaluate the policies to be able to have clarity of the goal, and then evaluate them under the standard of the State of no net loss. There will be ample opportunity at each step to have input and weigh in.

Commissioner Lippens wanted to make sure they can go back and revisit regulations that might be modified due to the cumulative analysis.

Mr. Pederson confirmed that there would be. He further explained that after the Planning Commission has finished their review and it goes through the County Commissioner’s local adoption process, the entire package has to be approved by the State Department of Ecology.

**Locally Adopt SMP**
In August, begin review/local adoption process of assembled Shoreline Master Program (SMP). At this point the Department will be pulling all these materials together and assembling a notebook with tabs that will show exactly what the Planning Commission will have for final review and recommendation.
The August 2011 version of the Island Co. Shoreline Inventory and Characterization report reflects revisions that occurred from several different sources. It takes into consideration comments from the Department of Ecology, the Shoreline Technical Advisory Group, and Salmon Technical Advisory Group. We are still getting inventory comments. Another revision of that document will be made and we are hoping to have all comments by the end of February.

The report addresses the watershed as shown in the first box, which is the landscape processes or the ecosystem-wide processes that is the focus of the characterization part of the report.

The second box shows the planning area divided into reaches (segments of shoreline with similar physical characteristics).

The third box is habitat which is where the body of the document talks about the 36 different reaches that are evaluating those particular reaches. (12 reaches on Camano, 24 on Whidbey). The reaches look at the habitat, catalog what is out there in terms of existing land uses and ecological conditions.

From that research 16 maps have been created that have been approved by the Dept of Ecology. This also created a reach worksheet, summary sheets.
(An example is shown on the next two pages)
REACH WW04
Crockett Lake, Keystone Ferry, Fort Casey
State Park, and Driftwood Park

REACH SUMMARY
Crockett Lake, Keystone Ferry, Fort Casey State Park, and Driftwood Park
(REACH WW04) extends south along the Ebey's Landing shoreline and east along
the Crockett Bay shoreline. The reach includes Keystone Harbor and Crockett
Lake, a lagoon area associated with the marine shoreline. This reach includes
the Washington State Ferries terminal at Keystone (positions 2), which provides
ferry service to Port Townsend and the Olympic Peninsula across Admiralty Inlet.
Geomorphic shoreline processes are characterized by a convergence of
two-drift cells along the Admiralty Bay shoreline, supporting the accretion area
barrier beach separating the bay from Crockett Lake lagoon immediately north.
The northwest and southeast portions of the shoreline are mapped with feeder
bluffs and transport zones.

Crockett Lake lagoon and adjacent associated wetlands provide significant habi-
tat, and is designated a waterfowl concentration area. The lagoon is modified by
the access road to the Ferry Terminal and Keystone Harbor. Admiralty Lagoon
(14 acres) is also within the reach, located immediately east of the Crockett Lake.
Four streams (no salmon use) drain to the shoreline. Mapped habitat within
acoustic areas includes pencil grass and hardstem clam areas, a weeded colony,
frogfish use, and continuous Kelp throughout coastal bluff areas.

Reach land use is characterized by public facilities: both within largely undevel-
oped park areas within Fort Casey State Park and Ebey's Landing, and high-
intensity facilities along and adjacent to Keystone Harbor. The ferry terminal facility
and public boat launch at the southeast mouth of the harbor include overwater
structures. Development within the State Park to the west of Keystone Harbor
also includes significant camping and access facilities within the shoreline.

Shoreline erosion is common through these areas. The shoreline area between
Admiralty Bay and Crockett Lake is developed with shoreline residential properties.

GEOMORPHIC KEY INFORMATION
Geomorphic Shoretype (Map 9)
See reach map - feeder bluff, feeder bluff exceptional, and transport zones along W facing shoreline, long accretion shoreform fronting
Crockett Lake and Keystone Ferry facility.

Net Shore Drift (Map 8)
Southward drift in a divergence zone at Portage Point extends
around Admiralty Head and converges with northward drift inside
Admiralty Bay.

Shoreform Current (Map 10)
Barrier Beach (36%) / Bluff-backed Beach (58%) / Artificial (6%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rating of Degradation</th>
<th>Coastal Floodplain:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least (37%) / Less (63%)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coastal Landslides & Toe Erosion: Steep Slopes
Landslide areas mapped at N and S ends of beach 5%

Shoreline Oblique photos (2006)
HABITATS & SPECIES

Significant & Unique Features (Maps 5-7)
- Mapped Seabird Colony (Alcids); Admiral's Lagoon - 14 acres; Crockett Lake is a brackish coastal lagoon with salt-marshes and associated freshwater wetlands - designated as Audubon Important Bird Area.

Shoreland Priority Habitats & Species (Map 5)
- Bald Eagle buffer; Cliffs; Wetlands; 3 acres of mapped Native Oaks and Grassland

Marine Priority Habitats & Species (Map 5)
- Waterbird Concentration through Crockett Lake lagoon

Salmonid Fish Use (Map 5)
- Nearshore areas are designated ESA critical habitat for Chinook (Puget Sound ESU)

LAND & SHORELINE USE

Shoreline Modifications (Map 13)
- Areas of significant modification: significant modification associated with Keystone Ferry Terminal (modification of connection between marine shoreline and Crockett Lake, riprap armoring fronting terminal facility); major boat launch facility immediately E of the ferry terminal; groins / breakwaters at entrance to Keystone Harbor; riparian areas impacted by historic clearing

Public Access (Map 16)
- Public lands and islands (some accessible only via watercraft) throughout majority of reach; County owned open space throughout much of Crockett Lake (small craft accessible); public facilities and access associated with Keystone Ferry Terminal; significant access provided by Fort Casey Historical State Park and adjoining Ebey's Landing National Historical Reserve

Zoning (Map 11)
- Rural (73%) / Rural Agriculture (12%) / Rural Residential (7%) / Commercial Agriculture (5%) / Parks (3%)

Overwater Structures (Map 14)
- Keystone Ferry Terminal (130 ft. long, 30 ft. wide pier; dolphin structures associated with pier); 2 piers at public boat launch; remnants pier immediately east of boat launch facility (piles and overwater structures remain)

Current Land Use (Map 12)
- Number of Parcels: 345; Average Parcel Size: 6.54 Acres

- Primarily public park lands; significant open space associated with uses throughout reach; major public shoreline facilities at Keystone Harbor; shoreline residential development to the E of harbor

Shellfish & Aquaculture (Map 15)
- Unclassified shellfish growing area; no mapped or classified shellfish beaches

KEY MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- Continued degradation of shoreline processes due to armoring (bulkheads)
- Drinking water supply (aquifer) issues associated with additional development (subdivision / intensified use) - saltwater intrusion and potential exacerbation from SLR; limited areas of 'High Risk' for saltwater intrusion in Keystone vicinity (Island County Risk Rating Map)
- Redevelopment and/or intensified use of Keystone Ferry Terminal and adjacent intensive active use areas
- Restoration of connection between Lake Crockett and the marine shoreline
- Implications of additional private shoreline access points on high bank shorelines (accessory to residential development)
- Potential implications of sea level rise (SLR) on coastal lagoons and barrier beaches (loss of habitat)
- Potential increases in coastal flooding and rates of bluff erosion due to sea level rise (SLR) or other factors
- Potential use conflicts associated with public access to beaches and private residential property rights
- Subdivision and intensified use - additional modification of feeder bluff / steep slope areas and water quality implications (septic systems and road runoff) due to greater intensity of use

RESTORATION OPPORTUNITIES

- Restoration sites were identified in 2004 by Coastal Geologic Services (Appendix I)

CGS Restoration and Opportunity Description
- R73: Remove 115 crescent piles and old structures in subtidal area.
Existing land use classification (from Island County Assessor)

- Residential: 39.6%
- Vacant: 4.3%
- Agriculture: 10.2%
- Tidelands: 4.7%
- Unclassified: 2.9%
- Parks and Open Space: 4.4%
- Forest or Timber: 2.2%
- Commercial: 30.8%

Island County Shorelines—Zoning

- Rural: 59%
- Rural Residential: 4%
- Rural Agriculture: 3%
- Parks: 8%
- Commercial Agriculture: 1%
- Federal: 17%
- Rural Forest: 1%
- Other: 1%
Commissioner Mitchell Howard asked what qualifies for a stretch of shoreline to be called vacant.

Ms. Stewart replied that according to the Assessor’s data a legal lot with a dwelling on it is tagged as residential and if there is not a dwelling on it, it is tagged as vacant.

Commissioner Yonkman asked if the distance of 200 ft. from ordinary high water is what is considered shoreline.

Ms. Stewart confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Enell asked about the lakes.

Ms. Stewart stated there are six fresh water lakes that are big enough to be under the Shoreline Management Act and those are also included in this review.

The cumulative impact analysis looks at what the new regulations and policies that would be adopted with a new SMP and what that would really impact. Existing development is grandfathered, but the 30% of vacant land would potentially be impacted.
Theoretical number of lots that could be added and their likely sizes: 9,400 existing lots could grow by as much as 3,200 lots under the existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning. This analysis did not discount for wetlands, poor access, or other site constraints, and was based on actual lot areas and minimum lot sizes in each zone. These numbers indicate that approximately 34% growth can occur under current zoning. This analysis is the broadest case. This does not encompass critical areas or lot constraints.

Existing residential lots and residences per zone

Rural 5 acres
Lot size averaging allows minimum lot size of 2.5 acres
Rural Residential—higher densities

RAIDs in Island County Shorelines

- 39 total
- 34 partially within shoreline jurisdiction
- 32% of all shoreline parcels in County

(Legend for next page)
Ms. Stewart stated there are 4 different types of physical characteristics along the shoreline that impact the level of development that has occurred and will occur in the future.

Large landslide hazard areas, these would be areas that might extend well beyond shoreline jurisdiction of 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark and they are geological hazardous areas as defined in the Critical Areas Ordinance.

Coastal feeder bluffs with landslide and erosion hazard areas.

Fill at toe of coastal bluffs - small beach cabins that were historically for summer homes with fill at the toe of the coastal bluff. Many of these developed on very small lots are now being redeveloped with much larger homes being used year round.

With greater density and year round population the issues of difficult access, emergency evacuation, and storm potential are some topics that perhaps need to be addressed with this update.

Spits and barrier beaches - lots with water on various sides
These areas present major issues for development such as water supply, wastewater management, coastal storms, and flooding. Manmade canal communities require maintenance dredging, many docks, and piers.

Ms. Stewart then opened the floor to questions.

Commissioner Havens asked for clarification of the term ordinary high tide.
Mr. Pederson stated that was different from high water mark. It depends on the activity of the tides on a parcel on the shoreline. The ordinary high water mark (OHWM) which is results of action of the tidal cycle on a shoreline parcel over a period of time, Ms. Stewart will be sending actual wording to the Planning Commissioners. OHWM determines other aspects of the regulatory programs. Sometimes it can be a little more intricate to determine.

Commissioner Havens stated he thought it was important to be very accurate when telling people what they can and can’t do with their property.

Commissioner Yonkman stated in his experience measuring setback lines for projects it seemed to be best determined by the vegetation. Vegetation can only survive a certain amount of salt water.

Commissioner Yonkman asked to define no net loss?

Ms. Stewart replied that it depends on what the particular environmental function was. For example, along the marine shoreline if there is sediment in a sediment transport zone, like a feeder bluff which is dumping sediment into the water, which then travels and is deposited somewhere to make a spit for example, the no net loss would mean someone could not block the feeder bluff from sloughing off into the water as it would rob that beach area from future sediment.

Commissioner Hillers stated that in the draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization, the section on page 3-3 which is about human activities (3.1.2) the information on farming seems really dated. She believes this comes from a 30 year old history book; she would like a more up to date version of agriculture in this document rather than relying on a history book.

Commissioner Hillers suggested the Agricultural Ordinance could provide better information or possibly the Critical Areas Ordinance may contain better language.

In the management recommendations, which are located in several places, including Chapter 8, 8-6 under **Water Quality**, Ag run off is a concern. The solution is to protect and restore vegetative buffers in Ag areas.

Commissioner Hillers stated she talked with Karen Bishop from the Conservation District, who had a suggestion to replace the part about vegetative buffers with the following wording:

> “carry out farm conservation planning on agricultural lands to identify specific threats to water quality and select NRCS best management practices to address these threats, and implement these best management practices.”

Commissioner Hillers felt this was broader than just the vegetative buffers and involves farm conservation plans.

RECESS

Chair Howard resumed the meeting.
Ms. Stewart continued with a discussion on the Shoreline Environment Designation Maps. The document handed out at the prior meeting, the Shoreline Designation Criteria (October 2011), a description of the methodology used in coming up with shoreline environment designations consistent with the new guidelines and the changes that are being recommended are summarized on page 3 of the document. (Inserted below)

What changes are recommended to the current SED titles and purpose statements?

1. Retain the Natural, Aquatic, and Shoreline Residential designations, but review the purpose statement to ensure that they are clear and effective at supporting the purposes of the SMA as well as the vision for shorelines in Island County.

2. Because all portions of the shoreline within incorporated areas are now outside of County jurisdiction, and because this includes most of the existing Urban designation in the Island County SMP, eliminate the Urban designation. The two shoreline areas within urban growth boundaries are appropriate for an Urban Conservancy designation, and include a small area in the Langley UGA and an area of shoreline in Freeland that is designated a Non-Municipal Urban Growth Area (NMUGA).

3. Designate areas currently outside of incorporated areas that support ferries, and commercial boatyards as High Intensity, to allow management of these areas in a manner that supports these water-dependent uses while providing adequate protection of shoreline ecology.

4. Because the stated purpose of the current Rural designation is not one of the objectives of the SMA and is better accomplished through zoning, eliminate the Rural designation.

5. Create a Rural Conservancy designation that has as its purpose protection of ecological functions, and conservation of existing natural resources and valuable historic and cultural areas in order to provide for sustained resource use, achieve natural floodplain processes, and provide recreational opportunities.

6. Because the purpose of the current Aquatic-Conservancy sub-designation is to protect fishery resources and these resources must be protected in all aquatic habitats, the sub-designation is not needed. Specific issues related to critical habitat areas can and must be addressed through critical saltwater habitat policies and regulations.

7. For all environments, refine the designation criteria to better align with the data available from the inventory so that the designations can be consistently applied across the county.

8. Consider parallel shoreline environment designations on areas landward of the ordinary high water mark to protect critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas and habitat areas that are relatively intact but may be separated from the shoreline by development.

The flow chart used to explain the methodology is on page 12 of the printed document. It shows how designations were assigned to specific areas. (Inserted below)
Figure 1. Designation Criteria Flow Chart

Criteria Definitions:

**Used or planned for ferries, commercial boatyards, or similar intensive water-dependent uses, including overwater areas?**

- **NO**
  - **Below the Ordinary High Water Mark (OHWM) of water bodies within shoreline jurisdiction?**
    - **NO**
      - **Ecologically intact or minimally altered shoreline, or shoreline of scientific or educational value, or shoreline that cannot be developed safely or without harm to critical saltwater or freshwater habitat?**
        - **NO**
          - **Shorelines within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) or Non-Municipal Urban Growth Areas (NMUGAs) that are not water-dependent, high intensity uses?**
            - **NO**
              - **Developed shoreline with moderate to higher density residential development, but not containing known wetlands, streams, steep slopes, feeder bluffs, or floodplains?**
                - **NO**
                  - **NO**
                    - **YES**
                      - **YES**
                        - **YES**
                          - **YES**
                            - **YES**
                              - **YES**
                                - **YES**

**YES**

- **YES**
  - **YES**
    - **YES**
      - **YES**
        - **YES**
          - **YES**

**HIGH INTENSITY**

**AQUATIC**

**NATURAL**

**URBAN CONSERVANCY**

**SHORELINE RESIDENTIAL**

**RURAL CONSERVANCY**

**Planned for ferries, commercial boatyards and similar intensive water-dependent uses, including overwater areas:** Sites adjacent to existing ferries, commercial boatyards and similar intensive water-dependent uses that are currently zoned to support intensive commercial or transportation uses. Overwater areas means the submerged portion of a parcel supporting the listed uses, and any tidelands leased for such uses or planned to be leased for such uses.

**Ecologically intact or minimally altered shoreline:** Sites generally free from structural shoreline modifications, structures, roads, and agricultural uses, or that have the potential to regain natural conditions with minimal or no restoration activity.

**Critical saltwater or freshwater habitat:** Definitions for these habitats are provided in WAC 173-26-221(2) and include kelp beds; eelgrass beds; spawning and holding areas for forage fish, such as herring, smelt and sand lance; subsistence, commercial and recreational shellfish beds; mudflats, intertidal habitats with vascular plants; and areas with which priority species have a primary association. Priority species are defined in WAC 173-26-020 and include state listed and proposed species; vulnerable aggregations; species of recreation, commercial or tribal importance; and species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act as proposed, threatened, or endangered.

**Moderate to higher density residential development:** Developed density of more than one unit per acre.
The culmination of the study with the consultants is the map which is available online. Ms. Stewart advised the Commission viewing it online would allow them to zoom in on specific items or areas they may be interested in.

In cases where there are parallel designations, such as seen along Tillicum Beach on Camano Island, it is a new approach to the designations. It reflects the shoreline conditions, the environment, and the level of existing development. The criterion was also shown on page 3, # 8.

8. “Consider parallel shoreline environment designations on areas landward of the ordinary high water mark to protect critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas and habitat areas that are relatively intact but may be separated from the shoreline by development.”

There are about half a dozen of these areas that are typically bluff backed beaches, such as Bells Beach, Tyee Beach, Dugualla Bay, and Tillicum Beach. In the Bells Beach example, the development on the beach is at a fairly intense level and merits the Shoreline Residential designation. Then there is the road which is the access to those homes and then landward of the road is an area that is not developed intensely.

It is proposed to differentiate those two areas instead of using a broad brush which shows the whole area as Shoreline Residential. Based on the existing land use patterns of the current zoning, it acknowledges the existing development as Shoreline Residential and the landward area on the other side of the road is proposed to be designated as Rural Conservancy to better protect areas that for example have a nicely vegetative bluff to keep the entire bluff from being developed as intensely as the shoreline.

One of the topics that Ms. Stewart as a planner felt was key is the category of Natural and what Natural really means, and where it is appropriate. In most places the Natural designation is only applied to publicly owned lands. There may be a few instances where certain private areas that do not have any development potential can be categorized as Natural with the incentive of maybe a tax break under the PBRS program.

Ms. Stewart then pointed out that the Urban Conservancy designation does not show up in many places, but it was needed to highlight places like Holmes Harbor in the Freeland NMUGA and some lots east of Langley within the UGA. These are the only areas Urban Conservancy was applied.

Shoreline Residential is the smallest lots, the most intensively developed. By in large Rural Conservative is the main designation.

The High Intensity designations are just being proposed at the two ferry landings, at Cornet Bay at the marina, and also at the Nichols Brothers Boat Ramp at the toe of Holmes Harbor.

The other thing to mention about the Natural designation and publicly owned lands is that there has been pushback in the past from State Parks who feel their permitting process for boat ramps or buildings becomes more arduous than it should be. It may be something the Commission may like to address in the body of the plan if they decide to keep the Natural designation, by having
exceptions to allow park facilities like boat ramps. The broad stroke approach of all publicly owned lands being designated as Natural is a starting point.

Commissioner Enell asked how big the change was compared to what is existing.

Ms. Stewart replied that the biggest change is that there will no longer be County designations in Oak Harbor as they are updating their Shoreline Master Program and the County does not have any jurisdiction along Crescent Harbor for example. The other big change is fine tuning the designations, showing more Rural Conservancy than in the past.

Ms. Stewart stated that she has worked on five other jurisdiction’s shoreline programs and one of the nice things about Island County’s update is that it had been somewhat recently updated so the classifications only needed to be tweaked slightly, but did not constitute a major change.

**Preliminary Shoreline Use Matrix**

The next topic is the matrix, highlighting the changes. One of the issues was trying to make the matrix more user-friendly.

People often wonder what the difference is between shoreline uses and shoreline modifications. State law defines shoreline uses as things such as a marina and a shoreline modification would be dredging for the marina as an example.

A few items being proposed to add or change to the existing matrix are:

- Floating homes and house boats
- Industrial uses
- Log storage
- Current table says transient accommodations the new table uses tourist accommodations
- Navigational signs
- Shoreline stabilization will replace bulkheads.

**Resource Management and Extraction**

Aquaculture within districts are subject to shoreline conditional use permits and it is being proposed for the aquatic to have it just require a standard shoreline development permit, meaning a simpler process to encourage aquaculture.

Forest Practices – under the Natural it is being proposed to possibly prohibit forest practices (5000 board feet or greater) in the Natural designation. This is not referring to the simple clearing and grading, but substantial cutting.

Commissioner Hillers wondered if there was a massive blow down would this type of prohibition on the size of clearing be an issue.
Ms. Stewart replied a timber salvage operation in the event of a storm related blow down could be exempt from this prohibition if the Planning Commission wished to add such language. More restrictions for forest practices are being considered because under the emphasis of no net loss, State studies show vegetation conservation is really important in the shoreline area. To the extent to can keep the trees and the ground cover provides better habitat and keeps the slopes more stable.

Another change for the Natural designation is to prohibit mining within the natural shoreline designation. It is currently allowed, subject to a conditional use permit.

**Transportation**
Bridges do not show on this matrix as a shoreline use, but will need to be included. For places like Snakelum Point where there is a bridge to go out to the spit; it is all under shoreline jurisdiction. A discussion on what the bridge may need to look like to be as compatible as possible will need to occur.

**Tourist Accommodations**
This draft is proposing to be more open to the possibility of hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, inns, and country inns locating in shoreline jurisdiction. It reflects the fact that the islands are in part a tourist economy. There may be some areas within shoreline jurisdiction that are suitable for these types of uses. With a conditional use permit a site specific consideration could be taken.

Restricting these uses outright seemed unnecessary and contradictory to the Shoreline Management Act’s terms of water dependant uses and water enjoyment uses. It is something that is supposed to be promoted in these shoreline programs.

**Signs**
Navigational signs were added in this category. The two categories that exist within the current program are off premises and on premises directional signs, the proposed change is that the aquatic signs don’t really need to be in the water. Right now they are listed as shoreline conditional use permits and it is proposed to prohibit these in the water.

A discussion by the Commission of specifics on the definitions of particular types of signs was stated would be helpful.

Ms. Stewart agreed that there should be more specifics as to what the new navigational sign definition is as well as including it in the glossary and having sign standards for these signs. The existing categories should already be included.

**Shoreline Modifications**
The existing matrix did not have bulkheads addressed properly, so this has been corrected. Shoreline stabilization will need to address more than just bulkheads in the documents however.

Under groins and jetties, the proposed matrix would have these listed as conditional use permits as these are discouraged due to the fact that they disrupt the sediment transport.
Landfill and grading for the Natural designation is proposed to be changed from a prohibited use to needing a conditional use permit. Restoration projects have had a hard time in the Natural environment to do what is needed.

Commissioner Howard asked if there are any questions, hearing none

*Commissioner Hillers moved to adjourn, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

Meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Bradshaw
Meeting called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chair Enell

**ROLL CALL**
Wayne Haven, Scott Yonkman, Mitchell Howard, Dean Enell, Mike Joselyn, Val Hillers, Bill Lippens

Planning staff present: Robert Pederson – Director, Karen Stewart – Shoreline Master Program Planner/Coordinator.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
November 22, 2011

*Commissioner Yonkman moved to approve the minutes as presented, Commissioner Howard seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

**ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**
None

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Mr. Pederson announced that Leal Dickson was appointed by the Board of Island County Commissioners to fill an expired term in District 2. He is out of town with a prior commitment for this meeting, but will be at the Joint Meeting on February 13th.

Training for new Historical Preservation Commission (HPC) is underway. This Thursday they will be electing their officers. The parties are trying to be flexible about the new process and for the first year even those decisions which will be made administratively will be brought to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).
On the appeal of CPA 155/04, Oak Harbor UGA the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board rejected all 16 of the City’s claims. The City filed an appeal of that decision to Thurston County Superior Court. A hearings schedule has not yet been set.

The Board did not take action to opt in to the voluntary stewardship program under ESHB 1886 also known as the Ruckelshaus Center process. The County will proceed forward to defend the ordinance that regulates agricultural activities in respect to critical areas.

Karen Stewart will be talking about the Shoreline Master Program Update today and will be very involved with the Planning Commission as needed during this process.

**NEW BUSINESS  – Election of Officers**

Chair Enell asked for nominations for the 2012 Officers.

**Chair:**

*Commissioner Joselyn nominated Mr. Havens, Commissioner Howard seconded the motion.*

*Commissioner Enell then nominated Commissioner Howard and Commissioner Lippens seconded motion.*

Director Pederson suggested since there were two motions on the floor to have a show of hands for the nominees. Three votes for Commissioner Havens, Four votes for Commissioner Howard.

**Vice Chair:**

*Commissioner Hillers nominated Commissioner Havens for Vice Chair, Commissioner Havens declined.*

*Commissioner Howard nominated Commissioner Yonkman, Commissioner Yonkman also declined.*

*Commissioner Enell nominated Commissioner Lippens, Commissioner Hillers seconded.* Commissioner Lippens advised he may be moving to San Francisco for a job opportunity.

Commissioner Havens stated he would be willing to take the Vice Chair in the event Commissioner Lippens takes the position in San Francisco.

*Commissioner Enell amended his motion to nominate Commissioner Lippens as Vice Chair, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

The motion was then revised to include Commissioner Havens as second Vice Chair to cover any occasion where the Chair and Vice Chair are both unable to attend, with the second Vice Chair moving up to Vice Chair should it be necessary.

*The amended motion then carried unanimously.*
NEW BUSINESS - Workshop

Workshop related to the Shoreline Master Program Update, a presentation on the Draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report and discussion of draft preliminary shoreline environment designations.

SMP Coordinator Karen Stewart advised all of today’s materials with the exception of the PowerPoint presentation are currently on the County Planning Department WebPages.

As the process gets further down the line, the strike out and underline copy the Commission typically sees will be made available. Deliberations and recommendations to the Board of Commissioners are expected to occur in August of this year.

Island County SMP

Presentation of Key Data and Issues from Shoreline Inventory

Review Shoreline Environment Designations Maps

Existing

Proposed

Shoreline Use Matrix
SMP Preparation Process - The State Department of Ecology review reminds us that this is a State program. In order for it to be effective it must be approved by the State.

**Conduct Inventory and Analysis** – August 2011 document.
Inventory and characterization study is a key document; it provides a baseline for planning and measuring ecological conditions.

**Designate Environments and Frame Goals and Policies**
Shoreline Environment Designation (SED), this is basically zoning in the shoreline and discusses the different permit types, such as Shoreline Substantial Development permits, Shoreline Conditional Use permits, Shoreline Variances and how those would be applied to various uses and modifications within shoreline jurisdiction. There are also applications that are exempt from the Shoreline Substantial Development permits.

The process will answer questions such as what uses should be prohibited along the shoreline and what kind of site specific conditions will be needed in order to make a proposal compatible with adjacent uses and minimize environmental impacts.
**Draft SMP**
This begins discussing proposed goals and policies, this will look much like the other elements in the Comprehensive Plan and in fact, the goals and policies of the Shoreline Master Program are technically the fourteenth element of the Comprehensive Plan.

It does however get a bit complicated because it is not just under the Growth Management Act (GMA) it is under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). A draft of the goals and policies are scheduled to come to the Planning Commission in March.

Over the last few months a series of public workshops on some of the key shoreline issues, (beach public access, residential development, and slope stabilization) have been held in the community. Meetings have been held to gather input to better inform our policy writing. They will be drafted consistent with the input, policies, and State guidelines. Then the actual regulations and development standards will be worked on and are expected to come to the Planning Commission by May at the latest.

**Conduct the Cumulative Impact Analysis**
This will be ready in early June. This is one of the feedback loops. There is the goals and policies, the regulations, then the cumulative impact analysis is prepared and it feeds back in as they begin testing the proposed regulatory scheme to see if it meets the requirement of *No Net Loss* of ecological function. It is shared with the experts at the Department of Ecology (DOE) to make sure we are within the guidelines. Things may need to be adjusted after that analysis.

Commissioner Lippens wanted to know why the impact analysis is after the review.

Ms. Stewart replied that there needs to be an initial discussion and review so time is not spent on a cumulative impact analysis of regulations that aren’t really what the local jurisdiction wants.

Director Pederson added that under State standard there is no net loss. The discussion of policy gets lost when trying to drill down on the particulars of the regulations. You want to evaluate the policies to be able to have clarity of the goal, and then evaluate them under the standard of the State of no net loss. There will be ample opportunity at each step to have input and weigh in.

Commissioner Lippens wanted to make sure they can go back and revisit regulations that might be modified due to the cumulative analysis.

Mr. Pederson confirmed that there would be. He further explained that after the Planning Commission has finished their review and it goes through the County Commissioner’s local adoption process, the entire package has to be approved by the State Department of Ecology.

**Locally Adopt SMP**
In August, begin review/local adoption process of assembled Shoreline Master Program (SMP). At this point the Department will be pulling all these materials together and assembling a notebook with tabs that will show exactly what the Planning Commission will have for final review and recommendation.
The August 2011 version of the Island Co. Shoreline Inventory and Characterization report reflects revisions that occurred from several different sources. It takes into consideration comments from the Department of Ecology, the Shoreline Technical Advisory Group, and Salmon Technical Advisory Group. We are still getting inventory comments. Another revision of that document will be made and we are hoping to have all comments by the end of February.

The report addresses the watershed as shown in the first box, which is the landscape processes or the ecosystem-wide processes that is the focus of the characterization part of the report.

The second box shows the planning area divided into reaches (segments of shoreline with similar physical characteristics).

The third box is habitat which is where the body of the document talks about the 36 different reaches that are evaluating those particular reaches. (12 reaches on Camano, 24 on Whidbey). The reaches look at the habitat, catalog what is out there in terms of existing land uses and ecological conditions.

From that research 16 maps have been created that have been approved by the Dept of Ecology. This also created a reach worksheet, summary sheets. (An example is shown on the next two pages)
REACH WW04
Crockett Lake, Keystone Ferry, Fort Casey State Park, and Driftwood Park

REACH SUMMARY
Crockett Lake, Keystone Ferry, Fort Casey State Park, and Driftwood Park (Reach WW04) extends south along the Ebey’s Landing shoreline and east along the Crockett Bay shoreline. The reach includes Keystone Harbor and Crockett Lake, a lagoon area associated with the marine shoreline. This reach includes the Washington State Ferries terminal at Keystone (Figure 2), which provides ferry service to Port Townsend and the Olympic Peninsula across Admiralty Inlet. Geomorphic shoreline processes are characterized by a convergence of two drift cells along the Admiralty Bay shoreline, supporting the accretion area barren beach separating the bay from Crockett Lake lagoon immediately north. The northwest and southeast portions of the shoreline are mapped with feeder bluffs and transport zones.

Crockett Lake lagoon and adjoining associated wetlands provide significant habitat, and is designated a waterfowl concentration area. The lagoon is modified by the access road to the Ferry Terminal and Keystone Harbor. Admirals Lagoon (14 acres) is also within the reach, located immediately east of the Crockett Lake. Four streams (no salmon use) drain to the shoreline. Mapped habitat within aquatic areas includes pended shrimp and hardshell clam areas, a seaweed colony, forage fish use, and continuous Kelp throughout coastal bluff areas.

Reach land use is characterized by public facilities – both within largely undeveloped park areas within Fort Casey State Park and Ebey’s Landing, and high-intensity facilities along and adjacent to Keystone Harbor. The ferry terminal facility and a public boat launch at the southeast mouth of the harbor include overwater structures. Development within the State Park to the west of Keystone Harbor includes significant camping and access facilities within the shoreline.

Shoreline accretion is common throughout these areas. The broadest area between Admiralty Bay and Crockett Lake is developed with shoreline residential properties.

GEOMORPHIC KEY INFORMATION
Geomorphic Shoretype (Map 9)
See reach map - feeder bluff, feeder bluff exceptional, and transport zones along W facing shoreline, long accretion shoreform fronting Crockett Lake and Keystone Ferry facility

Net Shore Drift (Map 8)
Southward drift at a divergence zone at Pointe Point extends around Admiralty Head and converges with northward drift inside Admiralty Bay.

Shoreform Current (Map 10)
Barrier Beach (35%) / Bluff-Backed Beach (58%) / Artificial (8%)

Overall Rating of Degradation
Coastal Floodplain: Least (37%) / Less (53%) 46%

Coastal Landslides & Toe Erosion: Steep Slopes
Landslide areas mapped at N and S ends of reach 5%
HABITATS & SPECIES

Significant & Unique Features (Maps 5-7)
Mapped Seabird Colony (Auklets); Admiral’s Lagoon - 14 acres; Crockett Lake is a brackish coastal lagoon with salt-marshes and associated freshwater wetlands - designated as Audubon Important Bird Area.

Coastal Lagoons
- 18 acres (1%)

Forage Fish
- Sand lance 6%
- Smelt 2%
- Herring - None mapped

Coastal Stream Mouths
- 4

Shoreland Priority Habitats & Species (Map 5)
- Bald Eagle buffer; Cliffs; Wetlands; 3 acres of mapped Native Oaks and Grassland

Marine Priority Habitats & Species (Map 5)
- Waterfowl concentration through Crockett Lake lagoon

Salmonid Fish Use (Map 5)
- Nearshore areas are designated ESA critical habitat for Chinook (Puget Sound ESU)

LAND & SHORELINE USE

Shoreline Modifications (Map 13)
Areas of significant modification: significant modification associated with Keystone Ferry Terminal (modification of connection between marine shoreline and Crockett Lake, riprap armoring fronting terminal facility; major boat launch facility immediately E of the ferry terminal; groins / breakwaters at entrance to Keystone Harbor; riparian areas impacted by historic clearing

Zoning (Map 11)
- Rural (73%) / Rural Agriculture (12%) / Rural Residential (7%) / Commercial Agriculture (5%) / Parks (3%)

Current Land Use (Map 12)
- Number of Parcels: 345
- Average Parcel Size: 6.64 Acres
- Primarily public park lands; significant open space associated with uses throughout reach; major public shoreline facilities at Keystone Harbor; shoreline residential development to the E of harbor

Public Access (Map 16)
- Public lands and tidelands (some accessible only via watercraft) throughout majority of reach; County owned open space throughout much of Crockett Lake (small craft accessible); public facilities and access associated with Keystone Ferry Terminal; significant access provided by Fort Casey Historical State Park and adjoining Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve

Overwater Structures (Map 14)
- Keystone Ferry Terminal (130 ft. long, 30 ft. wide pier; dolphin structures associated with pier); 2 piers at public boat launch; remnant pier immediately east of boat launch facility (piles and overwater structures remain)

Shellfish & Aquaculture (Map 15)
- Unclassified shellfish growing area; no mapped or classified shellfish beaches

KEY MANAGEMENT ISSUES

- Continued degradation of shoreline processes due to armoring (bulkheads)
- Drinking water supply (aquifer) issues associated with additional development (subdivision / intensified use) - saltwater intrusion and potential exacerbation from SLR; limited areas of ‘High Risk’ for saltwater intrusion in Keystone vicinity (Island County Risk Rating Map)
- Redevelopment and /or intensified use of Keystone Ferry Terminal and adjacent intensive active use areas
- Restoration of connection between Lake Crockett and the marine shoreline
- Implications of additional private shoreline access points on high bank shorelines (accessory to residential development)
- Potential implications of sea level rise (SLR) on coastal lagoons and barrier beaches (loss of habitat)
- Potential increases in coastal flooding and rates of bluff erosion due to sea level rise (SLR) or other factors
- Potential use conflicts associated with public access to beaches and private residential property rights
- Subdivision and intensified use - additional modification of feeder bluff / steep slope areas and water quality implications (septic systems and road runoff) due to greater intensity of use

RESTORATION OPPORTUNITIES

- Restoration sites were identified in 2004 by Coastal Geologic Services (Appendix H)

CGR Restoration and Opportunity Description
- R71: Remove 116 creosote piles and old structures in subtidal area.
**Existing land use classification (from Island County Assessor)**

- Residential: 39.6%
- Vacant: 10.2%
- Agriculture: 4.7%
- Tidelands: 4.4%
- Unclassified: 2.9%
- Parks and Open Space: 2.2%
- Forest or Timber: 4.3%
- Commercial: 0.8%

**Island County Shorelines—Zoning**

- Rural: 59%
- Rural Residential: 3%
- Rural Agriculture: 8%
- Parks: 7%
- Commercial Agriculture: 4%
- Federal: 1%
- Rural Forest: 1%
- Other: 17%
Commissioner Mitchell Howard asked what qualifies for a stretch of shoreline to be called vacant.

Ms. Stewart replied that according to the Assessor’s data a legal lot with a dwelling on it is tagged as residential and if there is not a dwelling on it, it is tagged as vacant.

Commissioner Yonkman asked if the distance of 200 ft. from ordinary high water is what is considered shoreline.

Ms. Stewart confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Enell asked about the lakes.

Ms. Stewart stated there are six fresh water lakes that are big enough to be under the Shoreline Management Act and those are also included in this review.

The cumulative impact analysis looks at what the new regulations and policies that would be adopted with a new SMP and what that would really impact. Existing development is grandfathered, but the 30% of vacant land would potentially be impacted.
Theoretical number of lots that could be added and their likely sizes: 9,400 existing lots could grow by as much as 3,200 lots under the existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning. This analysis did not discount for wetlands, poor access, or other site constraints, and was based on actual lot areas and minimum lot sizes in each zone. These numbers indicate that approximately 34% growth can occur under current zoning. This analysis is the broadest case. This does not encompass critical areas or lot constraints.

![Existing residential lots and residences per zone](image)

Rural 5 acres
Lot size averaging allows minimum lot size of 2.5 acres
Rural Residential—higher densities

RAIDs in Island County Shorelines

- 39 total
- 34 partially within shoreline jurisdiction
- 32% of all shoreline parcels in County

(Legend for next page)

Ms. Stewart stated there are 4 different types of physical characteristics along the shoreline that impact the level of development that has occurred and will occur in the future.

Large landslide hazard areas, these would be areas that might extend well beyond shoreline jurisdiction of 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark and they are geological hazardous areas as defined in the Critical Areas Ordinance.

**Coastal feeder bluffs** with landslide and erosion hazard areas.

**Fill at toe of coastal bluffs** - small beach cabins that were historically for summer homes with fill at the toe of the coastal bluff. Many of these developed on very small lots are now being redeveloped with much larger homes being used year round.

With greater density and year round population the issues of difficult access, emergency evacuation, and storm potential are some topics that perhaps need to be addressed with this update.

**Spits and barrier beaches** - lots with water on various sides
These areas present major issues for development such as water supply, wastewater management, coastal storms, and flooding. Manmade canal communities require maintenance dredging, many docks, and piers.

Ms. Stewart then opened the floor to questions.

Commissioner Havens asked for clarification of the term ordinary high tide.
Mr. Pederson stated that was different from high water mark. It depends on the activity of the tides on a parcel on the shoreline. The ordinary high water mark (OHWM) which is results of action of the tidal cycle on a shoreline parcel over a period of time, Ms. Stewart will be sending actual wording to the Planning Commissioners. OHWM determines other aspects of the regulatory programs. Sometimes it can be a little more intricate to determine.

Commissioner Havens stated he thought it was important to be very accurate when telling people what they can and can’t do with their property.

Commissioner Yonkman stated in his experience measuring setback lines for projects it seemed to be best determined by the vegetation. Vegetation can only survive a certain amount of salt water.

Commissioner Yonkman asked to define no net loss?

Ms. Stewart replied that it depends on what the particular environmental function was. For example, along the marine shoreline if there is sediment in a sediment transport zone, like a feeder bluff which is dumping sediment into the water, which then travels and is deposited somewhere to make a spit for example, the no net loss would mean someone could not block the feeder bluff from sloughing off into the water as it would rob that beach area from future sediment.

Commissioner Hillers stated that in the draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization, the section on page 3-3 which is about human activities (3.1.2) the information on farming seems really dated. She believes this comes from a 30 year old history book; she would like a more up to date version of agriculture in this document rather than relying on a history book.

Commissioner Hillers suggested the Agricultural Ordinance could provide better information or possibly the Critical Areas Ordinance may contain better language.

In the management recommendations, which are located in several places, including Chapter 8, 8-6 under Water Quality, Ag run off is a concern. The solution is to protect and restore vegetative buffers in Ag areas.

Commissioner Hillers stated she talked with Karen Bishop from the Conservation District, who had a suggestion to replace the part about vegetative buffers with the following wording:

“
carry out farm conservation planning on agricultural lands to identify specific threats to water quality and select NRCS best management practices to address these threats, and implement these best management practices.”

Commissioner Hillers felt this was broader than just the vegetative buffers and involves farm conservation plans.

RECESS

Chair Howard resumed the meeting.
Ms. Stewart continued with a discussion on the Shoreline Environment Designation Maps. The document handed out at the prior meeting, the Shoreline Designation Criteria (October 2011), a description of the methodology used in coming up with shoreline environment designations consistent with the new guidelines and the changes that are being recommended are summarized on page 3 of the document. (Inserted below)

**What changes are recommended to the current SED titles and purpose statements?**

1. Retain the Natural, Aquatic, and Shoreline Residential designations, but review the purpose statement to ensure that they are clear and effective at supporting the purposes of the SMA as well as the vision for shorelines in Island County.

2. Because all portions of the shoreline within incorporated areas are now outside of County jurisdiction, and because this includes most of the existing Urban designation in the Island County SMP, eliminate the Urban designation. The two shoreline areas within urban growth boundaries are appropriate for an Urban Conservancy designation, and include a small area in the Langley UGA and an area of shoreline in Freeland that is designated a Non-Municipal Urban Growth Area (NMUGA).

3. Designate areas currently outside of incorporated areas that support ferries, and commercial boatyards as High Intensity, to allow management of these areas in a manner that supports these water-dependent uses while providing adequate protection of shoreline ecology.

4. Because the stated purpose of the current Rural designation is not one of the objectives of the SMA and is better accomplished through zoning, eliminate the Rural designation.

5. Create a Rural Conservancy designation that has as its purpose protection of ecological functions, and conservation of existing natural resources and valuable historic and cultural areas in order to provide for sustained resource use, achieve natural floodplain processes, and provide recreational opportunities.

6. Because the purpose of the current Aquatic-Conservancy sub-designation is to protect fishery resources and these resources must be protected in all aquatic habitats, the sub-designation is not needed. Specific issues related to critical habitat areas can and must be addressed through critical saltwater habitat policies and regulations.

7. For all environments, refine the designation criteria to better align with the data available from the inventory so that the designations can be consistently applied across the county.

8. Consider parallel shoreline environment designations on areas landward of the ordinary high water mark to protect critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas and habitat areas that are relatively intact but may be separated from the shoreline by development.

The flow chart used to explain the methodology is on page 12 of the printed document. It shows how designations were assigned to specific areas. (Inserted below)
Figure 1. Designation Criteria Flow Chart

Criteria Definitions:

Planned for ferries, commercial boatyards and similar intensive water-dependent uses, including overwater areas: Sites adjacent to existing ferries, commercial boatyards and similar intensive water-dependent uses that are currently zoned to support intensive commercial or transportation uses. Overwater areas means the submerged portion of a parcel supporting the listed uses, and any tidelands leased for such uses or planned to be leased for such uses.

Ecologically intact or minimally altered shoreline: Sites generally free from structural shoreline modifications, structures, roads, and agricultural uses, or that have the potential to regain natural conditions with minimal or no restoration activity.

Critical saltwater or freshwater habitat: Definitions for these habitats are provided in WAC 173-26-221(2) and include kelp beds; eelgrass beds; spawning and holding areas for forage fish, such as herring, smelt and sand lance; subsistence, commercial and recreational shellfish beds; mudflats, intertidal habitats with vascular plants; and areas with which priority species have a primary association. Priority species are defined in WAC 173-26-020 and include state listed and proposed species; vulnerable aggregations; species of recreation, commercial or tribal importance; and species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act as proposed, threatened, or endangered.

Moderate to higher density residential development: Developed density of more than one unit per acre.
The culmination of the study with the consultants is the map which is available online. Ms. Stewart advised the Commission viewing it online would allow them to zoom in on specific items or areas they may be interested in.

In cases where there are parallel designations, such as seen along Tillicum Beach on Camano Island, it is a new approach to the designations. It reflects the shoreline conditions, the environment, and the level of existing development. The criterion was also shown on page 3, # 8.

8. “Consider parallel shoreline environment designations on areas landward of the ordinary high water mark to protect critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas and habitat areas that are relatively intact but may be separated from the shoreline by development.”

There are about half a dozen of these areas that are typically bluff backed beaches, such as Bells Beach, Tyee Beach, Dugualla Bay, and Tillicum Beach. In the Bells Beach example, the development on the beach is at a fairly intense level and merits the Shoreline Residential designation. Then there is the road which is the access to those homes and then landward of the road is an area that is not developed intensely.

It is proposed to differentiate those two areas instead of using a broad brush which shows the whole area as Shoreline Residential. Based on the existing land use patterns of the current zoning, it acknowledges the existing development as Shoreline Residential and the landward area on the other side of the road is proposed to be designated as Rural Conservancy to better protect areas that for example have a nicely vegetative bluff to keep the entire bluff from being developed as intensely as the shoreline.

One of the topics that Ms. Stewart as a planner felt was key is the category of Natural and what Natural really means, and where it is appropriate. In most places the Natural designation is only applied to publicly owned lands. There may be a few instances where certain private areas that do not have any development potential can be categorized as Natural with the incentive of maybe a tax break under the PBRS program.

Ms. Stewart then pointed out that the Urban Conservancy designation does not show up in many places, but it was needed to highlight places like Holmes Harbor in the Freeland NMUGA and some lots east of Langley within the UGA. These are the only areas Urban Conservancy was applied.

Shoreline Residential is the smallest lots, the most intensively developed. By in large Rural Conservative is the main designation.

The High Intensity designations are just being proposed at the two ferry landings, at Cornet Bay at the marina, and also at the Nichols Brothers Boat Ramp at the toe of Holmes Harbor.

The other thing to mention about the Natural designation and publicly owned lands is that there has been pushback in the past from State Parks who feel their permitting process for boat ramps or buildings becomes more arduous than it should be. It may be something the Commission may like to address in the body of the plan if they decide to keep the Natural designation, by having
exceptions to allow park facilities like boat ramps. The broad stroke approach of all publicly owned lands being designated as Natural is a starting point.

Commissioner Enell asked how big the change was compared to what is existing.

Ms. Stewart replied that the biggest change is that there will no longer be County designations in Oak Harbor as they are updating their Shoreline Master Program and the County does not have any jurisdiction along Crescent Harbor for example. The other big change is fine tuning the designations, showing more Rural Conservancy than in the past.

Ms. Stewart stated that she has worked on five other jurisdiction’s shoreline programs and one of the nice things about Island County’s update is that it had been somewhat recently updated so the classifications only needed to be tweaked slightly, but did not constitute a major change.

**Preliminary Shoreline Use Matrix**

The next topic is the matrix, highlighting the changes. One of the issues was trying to make the matrix more user-friendly.

People often wonder what the difference is between shoreline uses and shoreline modifications. State law defines shoreline uses as things such as a marina and a shoreline modification would be dredging for the marina as an example.

A few items being proposed to add or change to the existing matrix are:

- Floating homes and house boats
- Industrial uses
- Log storage
- Current table says transient accommodations the new table uses tourist accommodations
- Navigational signs
- Shoreline stabilization will replace bulkheads.

**Resource Management and Extraction**

Aquaculture within districts are subject to shoreline conditional use permits and it is being proposed for the aquatic to have it just require a standard shoreline development permit, meaning a simpler process to encourage aquaculture.

Forest Practices – under the Natural it is being proposed to possibly prohibit forest practices (5000 board feet or greater) in the Natural designation. This is not referring to the simple clearing and grading, but substantial cutting.

Commissioner Hillers wondered if there was a massive blow down would this type of prohibition on the size of clearing be an issue.
Ms. Stewart replied a timber salvage operation in the event of a storm related blow down could be exempt from this prohibition if the Planning Commission wished to add such language. More restrictions for forest practices are being considered because under the emphasis of *no net loss*, State studies show vegetation conservation is really important in the shoreline area. To the extent to can keep the trees and the ground cover provides better habitat and keeps the slopes more stable.

Another change for the Natural designation is to prohibit mining within the natural shoreline designation. It is currently allowed, subject to a conditional use permit.

**Transportation**
Bridges do not show on this matrix as a shoreline use, but will need to be included. For places like Snakelum Point where there is a bridge to go out to the spit; it is all under shoreline jurisdiction. A discussion on what the bridge may need to look like to be as compatible as possible will need to occur.

**Tourist Accommodations**
This draft is proposing to be more open to the possibility of hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, inns, and country inns locating in shoreline jurisdiction. It reflects the fact that the islands are in part a tourist economy. There may be some areas within shoreline jurisdiction that are suitable for these types of uses. With a conditional use permit a site specific consideration could be taken.

Restricting these uses outright seemed unnecessary and contradictory to the Shoreline Management Act’s terms of water dependant uses and water enjoyment uses. It is something that is supposed to be promoted in these shoreline programs.

**Signs**
Navigational signs were added in this category. The two categories that exist within the current program are off premises and on premises directional signs, the proposed change is that the aquatic signs don’t really need to be in the water. Right now they are listed as shoreline conditional use permits and it is proposed to prohibit these in the water.

A discussion by the Commission of specifics on the definitions of particular types of signs was stated would be helpful.

Ms. Stewart agreed that there should be more specifics as to what the new navigational sign definition is as well as including it in the glossary and having sign standards for these signs. The existing categories should already be included.

**Shoreline Modifications**
The existing matrix did not have bulkheads addressed properly, so this has been corrected. Shoreline stabilization will need to address more than just bulkheads in the documents however.

Under groins and jetties, the proposed matrix would have these listed as conditional use permits as these are discouraged due to the fact that they disrupt the sediment transport.
Landfill and grading for the Natural designation is proposed to be changed from a prohibited use to needing a conditional use permit. Restoration projects have had a hard time in the Natural environment to do what is needed.

Commissioner Howard asked if there are any questions, hearing none

*Commissioner Hillers moved to adjourn, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

Meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Bradshaw
Meeting called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chair Enell

**ROLL CALL**
Wayne Haven, Scott Yonkman, Mitchell Howard, Dean Enell, Mike Joselyn, Val Hillers, Bill Lippens

Planning staff present: Robert Pederson – Director, Karen Stewart – Shoreline Master Program Planner/Coordinator.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
November 22, 2011

*Commissioner Yonkman moved to approve the minutes as presented, Commissioner Howard seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

**ITEMS FROM THE PUBLIC**
None

**DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

Mr. Pederson announced that Leal Dickson was appointed by the Board of Island County Commissioners to fill an expired term in District 2. He is out of town with a prior commitment for this meeting, but will be at the Joint Meeting on February 13th.

Training for new Historical Preservation Commission (HPC) is underway. This Thursday they will be electing their officers. The parties are trying to be flexible about the new process and for the first year even those decisions which will be made administratively will be brought to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).
On the appeal of CPA 155/04, Oak Harbor UGA the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board rejected all 16 of the City’s claims. The City filed an appeal of that decision to Thurston County Superior Court. A hearings schedule has not yet been set.

The Board did not take action to opt in to the voluntary stewardship program under ESHB 1886 also known as the Ruckelshaus Center process. The County will proceed forward to defend the ordinance that regulates agricultural activities in respect to critical areas.

Karen Stewart will be talking about the Shoreline Master Program Update today and will be very involved with the Planning Commission as needed during this process.

**NEW BUSINESS – Election of Officers**

Chair Enell asked for nominations for the 2012 Officers.

**Chair:**

*Commissioner Joselyn nominated Mr. Havens, Commissioner Howard seconded the motion.*

*Commissioner Enell then nominated Commissioner Howard and Commissioner Lippens seconded motion.*

Director Pederson suggested since there were two motions on the floor to have a show of hands for the nominees. Three votes for Commissioner Havens, Four votes for Commissioner Howard.

**Vice Chair:**

*Commissioner Hillers nominated Commissioner Havens for Vice Chair, Commissioner Havens declined.*

*Commissioner Howard nominated Commissioner Yonkman, Commissioner Yonkman also declined.*

*Commissioner Enell nominated Commissioner Lippens, Commissioner Hillers seconded.* Commissioner Lippens advised he may be moving to San Francisco for a job opportunity.

Commissioner Havens stated he would be willing to take the Vice Chair in the event Commissioner Lippens takes the position in San Francisco.

*Commissioner Enell amended his motion to nominate Commissioner Lippens as Vice Chair, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

The motion was then revised to include Commissioner Havens as second Vice Chair to cover any occasion where the Chair and Vice Chair are both unable to attend, with the second Vice Chair moving up to Vice Chair should it be necessary.

*The amended motion then carried unanimously.*
NEW BUSINESS - Workshop

Workshop related to the Shoreline Master Program Update, a presentation on the Draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization Report and discussion of draft preliminary shoreline environment designations.

SMP Coordinator Karen Stewart advised all of today’s materials with the exception of the PowerPoint presentation are currently on the County Planning Department WebPages.

As the process gets further down the line, the strike out and underline copy the Commission typically sees will be made available. Deliberations and recommendations to the Board of Commissioners are expected to occur in August of this year.

Island County SMP

Presentation of Key Data and Issues from Shoreline Inventory

Review Shoreline Environment Designations Maps

Existing

Proposed

Shoreline Use Matrix
SMP Preparation Process

- The State Department of Ecology review reminds us that this is a State program. In order for it to be effective it must be approved by the State.

**Conduct Inventory and Analysis** – August 2011 document.
Inventory and characterization study is a key document; it provides a baseline for planning and measuring ecological conditions.

**Designate Environments and Frame Goals and Policies**
Shoreline Environment Designation (SED), this is basically zoning in the shoreline and discusses the different permit types, such as Shoreline Substantial Development permits, Shoreline Conditional Use permits, Shoreline Variances and how those would be applied to various uses and modifications within shoreline jurisdiction. There are also applications that are exempt from the Shoreline Substantial Development permits.

The process will answer questions such as what uses should be prohibited along the shoreline and what kind of site specific conditions will be needed in order to make a proposal compatible with adjacent uses and minimize environmental impacts.
Draft SMP
This begins discussing proposed goals and policies, this will look much like the other elements in the Comprehensive Plan and in fact, the goals and policies of the Shoreline Master Program are technically the fourteenth element of the Comprehensive Plan.

It does however get a bit complicated because it is not just under the Growth Management Act (GMA) it is under the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). A draft of the goals and policies are scheduled to come to the Planning Commission in March.

Over the last few months a series of public workshops on some of the key shoreline issues, (beach public access, residential development, and slope stabilization) have been held in the community. Meetings have been held to gather input to better inform our policy writing. They will be drafted consistent with the input, policies, and State guidelines. Then the actual regulations and development standards will be worked on and are expected to come to the Planning Commission by May at the latest.

Conduct the Cumulative Impact Analysis
This will be ready in early June. This is one of the feedback loops. There is the goals and policies, the regulations, then the cumulative impact analysis is prepared and it feeds back in as they begin testing the proposed regulatory scheme to see if it meets the requirement of No Net Loss of ecological function. It is shared with the experts at the Department of Ecology (DOE) to make sure we are within the guidelines. Things may need to be adjusted after that analysis.

Commissioner Lippens wanted to know why the impact analysis is after the review.

Ms. Stewart replied that there needs to be an initial discussion and review so time is not spent on a cumulative impact analysis of regulations that aren’t really what the local jurisdiction wants.

Director Pederson added that under State standard there is no net loss. The discussion of policy gets lost when trying to drill down on the particulars of the regulations. You want to evaluate the policies to be able to have clarity of the goal, and then evaluate them under the standard of the State of no net loss. There will be ample opportunity at each step to have input and weigh in.

Commissioner Lippens wanted to make sure they can go back and revisit regulations that might be modified due to the cumulative analysis.

Mr. Pederson confirmed that there would be. He further explained that after the Planning Commission has finished their review and it goes through the County Commissioner’s local adoption process, the entire package has to be approved by the State Department of Ecology.

Locally Adopt SMP
In August, begin review/local adoption process of assembled Shoreline Master Program (SMP). At this point the Department will be pulling all these materials together and assembling a notebook with tabs that will show exactly what the Planning Commission will have for final review and recommendation.
The August 2011 version of the Island Co. Shoreline Inventory and Characterization report reflects revisions that occurred from several different sources. It takes into consideration comments from the Department of Ecology, the Shoreline Technical Advisory Group, and Salmon Technical Advisory Group. We are still getting inventory comments. Another revision of that document will be made and we are hoping to have all comments by the end of February.

The report addresses the watershed as shown in the first box, which is the landscape processes or the ecosystem-wide processes that is the focus of the characterization part of the report.

The second box shows the planning area divided into reaches (segments of shoreline with similar physical characteristics).

The third box is habitat which is where the body of the document talks about the 36 different reaches that are evaluating those particular reaches. (12 reaches on Camano, 24 on Whidbey). The reaches look at the habitat, catalog what is out there in terms of existing land uses and ecological conditions.

From that research 16 maps have been created that have been approved by the Dept of Ecology. This also created a reach worksheet, summary sheets. (An example is shown on the next two pages)
REACH SUMMARY

Crockett Lake, Keystone Ferry, Fort Casey State Park, and Driftwood Park (Reach WW04) extends south along the Ebey's Landing shoreline and east along the Crockett Bay shoreline. This reach includes Keystone Harbor and Crockett Lake, a lagoon area associated with the marine shoreline. This reach includes the Washington State Ferries terminal at Keystone (Figure 3), which provides ferry service to Port Townsend and the Olympic Peninsula across Admiralty Inlet. Geomorphic shoreline processes are characterized by a convergence of two drift cells along the Admiralty Bay shoreline, supporting the accretion area barrier beach separating the bay from Crockett Lake lagoon immediately north. The northwest and southeast portions of the shoreline are mapped with feeder bluffs and transport zones.

Crockett Lake lagoon and adjoining associated wetlands provide significant habitat, and is designated a waterfowl concentration area. The lagoon is modified by the egress road to the Ferry Terminal and Keystone Harbor. Admiralty Lagoon (14 acres) is also within the reach, located immediately east of the Crockett Lake. Four streams (no salmon use) drain to the shoreline. Mapped habitat within aquatic areas includes eelgrass, kelp, and shellfish clam areas, a salted colony, fish finger, and continuous Kelp forest.

Reach land use is characterized by public facilities – both within largely undeveloped park areas within Fort Casey State Park and Ebey's Landing, and high intensity facilities along and adjacent to Keystone Harbor. The ferry terminal facility and public boat launch at the southeast mouth of the harbor include overwater structures. Development within the State Park to the west of Keystone Harbor includes significant camping and access facilities within the shoreline. Shoreline access is common through these areas. The shoreline area between Admiralty Bay and Crockett Lake is developed with shoreline residential properties.

GEOMORPHIC KEY INFORMATION

Geomorphic Shoretype (Map 9)
See reach map - feeder bluff, feeder bluff exceptional, and transport zones along W facing shoreline, long accretion shoreform fronting Crockett Lake and Keystone Ferry facility

Net Shore Drift (Map 8)
Southward drift at a divergence zone at Partridge Point extends around Admiralty Head and converges with northward drift inside Admiralty Bay.

Shoreline Current (Map 10)
Barrier Beach (35%) / Bluff-backed Beach (58%) / Artificial (8%)
HABITATS & SPECIES
Significant & Unique Features (Maps 5-7)
- Mapped Seabird Colony (Ailds); Admiral’s Lagoon - 14 acres; Crockett Lake is a brackish coastal lagoon with salt-marshes and associated freshwater wetlands - designated as Audubon Important Bird Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal Lagoons</th>
<th>Coastal Stream Mouths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 acres (1%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Forage Fish
- Sand lance: 0%
- Smelt: 2%
- Herring: None mapped

Shoreland Priority Habitats & Species (Map 5)
- Bald Eagle buffer; Cliffs; Wetlands; 3 acres of mapped Native Oaks and Grassland

Marine Priority Habitats & Species (Map 5)
- Waterbird concentration through Crockett Lake lagoon

Salmonid Fish Use (Map 5)
- Nearshore areas are designated ESA critical habitat for Chinook (Puget Sound ESU)

LAND & SHORELINE USE
Shoreline Modifications (Map 13)
- Areas of significant modification, significant modification associated with Keystone Ferry Terminal (modification of connection between marine shoreline and Crockett Lake, riprap armouring fronting terminal facility; major boat launch facility immediately E of the ferry terminal; groins / breakwaters at entrance to Keystone Harbor; riparian areas impacted by historic clearing

Zoning (Map 11)
- Rural (73%) / Rural Agriculture (12%) / Rural Residential (7%) / Commercial Agriculture (5%) / Parks (3%)

Current Land Use (Map 12)
- Number of Parcels: 345
- Average Parcel Size: 6.54 Acres
- Primarily public park lands, significant open space associated with uses throughout reach; major public shoreline facilities at Keystone Harbor; shoreline residential development to the E of harbor

Public Access (Map 16)
- Public lands and islands (some accessible only via watercraft) throughout majority of reach; County owned open space throughout much of Crockett Lake (small craft accessible); public facilities and access associated with Keystone Ferry Terminal; significant access provided by Fort Casey Historical State Park and adjoining Ebey’s Landing National Historical Reserve

Overwater Structures (Map 14)
- Keystone Ferry Terminal (130 ft. long, 30 ft. wide pier; dolphin structures associated with pier); 2 piers at public boat launch; remnant pier immediately east of boat launch facility; piers and overwater structures remain

Shellfish & Aquaculture (Map 15)
- Unclassified shellfish growing area; no mapped or classified shellfish beaches

KEY MANAGEMENT ISSUES
- Continued degradation of shoreline processes due to armoring (bulkheads)
- Drinking water supply (aquifer) issues associated with additional development (subdivision/intensified use) - saltwater intrusion and potential exacerbation from SLR; limited areas of ‘High Risk’ for saltwater intrusion in Keystone vicinity (Island County Risk Rating Map)
- Redevelopment and/or intensified use of Keystone Ferry Terminal and adjacent intensive active use areas
- Restoration of connection between Lake Crockett and the marine shoreline
- Implications of additional private shoreline access points on high bank shorelines (accessory to residential development)
- Potential implications of sea level rise (SLR) on coastal lagoons and barrier beaches (loss of habitat)
- Potential increases in coastal flooding and rates of bluff erosion due to sea level rise (SLR) or other factors
- Potential use conflicts associated with public access to beaches and private residential property rights
- Subdivision and intensified use – additional modification of feeder bluff / steep slope areas and water quality implications (septic systems and road runoff) due to greater intensity of use

RESTORATION OPPORTUNITIES
- Restoration sites were identified in 2004 by Coastal Geologic Services (Appendix H)

CGS Restoration and Opportunity Description
- RT1: Remove 115 creosote piles and old structures in subtidal area.
Existing land use classification (from Island County Assessor)

- Residential: 39.6%
- Vacant: 4.4%
- Agriculture: 4.7%
- Tidelands: 10.2%
- Unclassified: 2.9%
- Parks and Open Space: 2.2%
- Forest or Timber: 4.3%
- Commercial: 30.8%

Island County Shorelines—Zoning

- Rural: 59%
- Rural Residential: 17%
- Rural Agriculture: 8%
- Parks: 7%
- Commercial Agriculture: 3%
- Federal: 4%
- Rural Forest: 1%
- Other: 1%
Commissioner Mitchell Howard asked what qualifies for a stretch of shoreline to be called vacant.

Ms. Stewart replied that according to the Assessor’s data a legal lot with a dwelling on it is tagged as residential and if there is not a dwelling on it, it is tagged as vacant.

Commissioner Yonkman asked if the distance of 200 ft. from ordinary high water is what is considered shoreline.

Ms. Stewart confirmed that was correct.

Commissioner Enell asked about the lakes.

Ms. Stewart stated there are six fresh water lakes that are big enough to be under the Shoreline Management Act and those are also included in this review.

The cumulative impact analysis looks at what the new regulations and policies that would be adopted with a new SMP and what that would really impact. Existing development is grandfathered, but the 30% of vacant land would potentially be impacted.
Theoretical number of lots that could be added and their likely sizes: 9,400 existing lots could grow by as much as 3,200 lots under the existing Comprehensive Plan and zoning. This analysis did not discount for wetlands, poor access, or other site constraints, and was based on actual lot areas and minimum lot sizes in each zone. These numbers indicate that approximately 34% growth can occur under current zoning. This analysis is the broadest case. This does not encompass critical areas or lot constraints.

RAIDs in Island County Shorelines
- 39 total
- 34 partially within shoreline jurisdiction
- 32% of all shoreline parcels in County

(Legend for next page)

Ms. Stewart stated there are 4 different types of physical characteristics along the shoreline that impact the level of development that has occurred and will occur in the future.

Large landslide hazard areas, these would be areas that might extend well beyond shoreline jurisdiction of 200 feet from the ordinary high water mark and they are geological hazardous areas as defined in the Critical Areas Ordinance.

Coastal feeder bluffs with landslide and erosion hazard areas.

Fill at toe of coastal bluffs - small beach cabins that were historically for summer homes with fill at the toe of the coastal bluff. Many of these developed on very small lots are now being redeveloped with much larger homes being used year round.

With greater density and year round population the issues of difficult access, emergency evacuation, and storm potential are some topics that perhaps need to be addressed with this update.

Spits and barrier beaches - lots with water on various sides
These areas present major issues for development such as water supply, wastewater management, coastal storms, and flooding. Manmade canal communities require maintenance dredging, many docks, and piers.

Ms. Stewart then opened the floor to questions.

Commissioner Havens asked for clarification of the term ordinary high tide.
Mr. Pederson stated that was different from high water mark. It depends on the activity of the tides on a parcel on the shoreline. The ordinary high water mark (OHWM) which is results of action of the tidal cycle on a shoreline parcel over a period of time, Ms. Stewart will be sending actual wording to the Planning Commissioners. OHWM determines other aspects of the regulatory programs. Sometimes it can be a little more intricate to determine.

Commissioner Havens stated he thought it was important to be very accurate when telling people what they can and can’t do with their property.

Commissioner Yonkman stated in his experience measuring setback lines for projects it seemed to be best determined by the vegetation. Vegetation can only survive a certain amount of salt water.

Commissioner Yonkman asked to define no net loss?

Ms. Stewart replied that it depends on what the particular environmental function was. For example, along the marine shoreline if there is sediment in a sediment transport zone, like a feeder bluff which is dumping sediment into the water, which then travels and is deposited somewhere to make a spit for example, the no net loss would mean someone could not block the feeder bluff from sloughing off into the water as it would rob that beach area from future sediment.

Commissioner Hillers stated that in the draft Shoreline Inventory and Characterization, the section on page 3-3 which is about human activities (3.1.2) the information on farming seems really dated. She believes this comes from a 30 year old history book; she would like a more up to date version of agriculture in this document rather than relying on a history book.

Commissioner Hillers suggested the Agricultural Ordinance could provide better information or possibly the Critical Areas Ordinance may contain better language.

In the management recommendations, which are located in several places, including Chapter 8, 8-6 under Water Quality, Ag run off is a concern. The solution is to protect and restore vegetative buffers in Ag areas.

Commissioner Hillers stated she talked with Karen Bishop from the Conservation District, who had a suggestion to replace the part about vegetative buffers with the following wording:

“carry out farm conservation planning on agricultural lands to identify specific threats to water quality and select NRCS best management practices to address these threats, and implement these best management practices.”

Commissioner Hillers felt this was broader than just the vegetative buffers and involves farm conservation plans.

RECESS

Chair Howard resumed the meeting.
Ms. Stewart continued with a discussion on the Shoreline Environment Designation Maps. The document handed out at the prior meeting, the Shoreline Designation Criteria (October 2011), a description of the methodology used in coming up with shoreline environment designations consistent with the new guidelines and the changes that are being recommended are summarized on page 3 of the document. (Inserted below)

What changes are recommended to the current SED titles and purpose statements?

1. Retain the Natural, Aquatic, and Shoreline Residential designations, but review the purpose statement to ensure that they are clear and effective at supporting the purposes of the SMA as well as the vision for shorelines in Island County.

2. Because all portions of the shoreline within incorporated areas are now outside of County jurisdiction, and because this includes most of the existing Urban designation in the Island County SMP, eliminate the Urban designation. The two shoreline areas within urban growth boundaries are appropriate for an Urban Conservancy designation, and include a small area in the Langley UGA and an area of shoreline in Freeland that is designated a Non-Municipal Urban Growth Area (NMUGA).

3. Designate areas currently outside of incorporated areas that support ferries, and commercial boatyards as High Intensity, to allow management of these areas in a manner that supports these water-dependent uses while providing adequate protection of shoreline ecology.

4. Because the stated purpose of the current Rural designation is not one of the objectives of the SMA and is better accomplished through zoning, eliminate the Rural designation.

5. Create a Rural Conservancy designation that has as its purpose protection of ecological functions, and conservation of existing natural resources and valuable historic and cultural areas in order to provide for sustained resource use, achieve natural floodplain processes, and provide recreational opportunities.

6. Because the purpose of the current Aquatic-Conservancy sub-designation is to protect fishery resources and these resources must be protected in all aquatic habitats, the sub-designation is not needed. Specific issues related to critical habitat areas can and must be addressed through critical saltwater habitat policies and regulations.

7. For all environments, refine the designation criteria to better align with the data available from the inventory so that the designations can be consistently applied across the county.

8. Consider parallel shoreline environment designations on areas landward of the ordinary high water mark to protect critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas and habitat areas that are relatively intact but may be separated from the shoreline by development.

The flow chart used to explain the methodology is on page 12 of the printed document. It shows how designations were assigned to specific areas. (Inserted below)
Figure 1. Designation Criteria Flow Chart

Criteria Definitions:

Planned for ferries, commercial boatyards and similar intensive water-dependent uses, including overwater areas: Sites adjacent to existing ferries, commercial boatyards and similar intensive water-dependent uses that are currently zoned to support intensive commercial or transportation uses. Overwater areas means the submerged portion of a parcel supporting the listed uses, and any tidelands leased for such uses or planned to be leased for such uses.

Ecologically intact or minimally altered shoreline: Sites generally free from structural shoreline modifications, structures, roads, and agricultural uses, or that have the potential to regain natural conditions with minimal or no restoration activity.

Critical saltwater or freshwater habitat: Definitions for these habitats are provided in WAC 173-26-221(2) and include kelp beds; eelgrass beds; spawning and holding areas for forage fish, such as herring, smelt and sand lance; subsistence, commercial and recreational shellfish beds; mudflats, intertidal habitats with vascular plants; and areas with which priority species have a primary association. Priority species are defined in WAC 173-26-020 and include state listed and proposed species; vulnerable aggregations; species of recreation, commercial or tribal importance; and species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act as proposed, threatened, or endangered.

Moderate to higher density residential development: Developed density of more than one unit per acre.
The culmination of the study with the consultants is the map which is available online. Ms. Stewart advised the Commission viewing it online would allow them to zoom in on specific items or areas they may be interested in.

In cases where there are parallel designations, such as seen along Tillicum Beach on Camano Island, it is a new approach to the designations. It reflects the shoreline conditions, the environment, and the level of existing development. The criterion was also shown on page 3, #8.

8. “Consider parallel shoreline environment designations on areas landward of the ordinary high water mark to protect critical areas such as geologically hazardous areas and habitat areas that are relatively intact but may be separated from the shoreline by development.”

There are about half a dozen of these areas that are typically bluff backed beaches, such as Bells Beach, Tyee Beach, Dugualla Bay, and Tillicum Beach. In the Bells Beach example, the development on the beach is at a fairly intense level and merits the Shoreline Residential designation. Then there is the road which is the access to those homes and then landward of the road is an area that is not developed intensely.

It is proposed to differentiate those two areas instead of using a broad brush which shows the whole area as Shoreline Residential. Based on the existing land use patterns of the current zoning, it acknowledges the existing development as Shoreline Residential and the landward area on the other side of the road is proposed to be designated as Rural Conservancy to better protect areas that for example have a nicely vegetative bluff to keep the entire bluff from being developed as intensely as the shoreline.

One of the topics that Ms. Stewart as a planner felt was key is the category of Natural and what Natural really means, and where it is appropriate. In most places the Natural designation is only applied to publicly owned lands. There may be a few instances where certain private areas that do not have any development potential can be categorized as Natural with the incentive of maybe a tax break under the PBRS program.

Ms. Stewart then pointed out that the Urban Conservancy designation does not show up in many places, but it was needed to highlight places like Holmes Harbor in the Freeland NUGA and some lots east of Langley within the UGA. These are the only areas Urban Conservancy was applied.

Shoreline Residential is the smallest lots, the most intensively developed. By in large Rural Conservative is the main designation.

The High Intensity designations are just being proposed at the two ferry landings, at Cornet Bay at the marina, and also at the Nichols Brothers Boat Ramp at the toe of Holmes Harbor.

The other thing to mention about the Natural designation and publicly owned lands is that there has been pushback in the past from State Parks who feel their permitting process for boat ramps or buildings becomes more arduous than it should be. It may be something the Commission may like to address in the body of the plan if they decide to keep the Natural designation, by having
exceptions to allow park facilities like boat ramps. The broad stroke approach of all publicly owned lands being designated as Natural is a starting point.

Commissioner Enell asked how big the change was compared to what is existing.

Ms. Stewart replied that the biggest change is that there will no longer be County designations in Oak Harbor as they are updating their Shoreline Master Program and the County does not have any jurisdiction along Crescent Harbor for example. The other big change is fine tuning the designations, showing more Rural Conservancy than in the past.

Ms. Stewart stated that she has worked on five other jurisdiction’s shoreline programs and one of the nice things about Island County’s update is that it had been somewhat recently updated so the classifications only needed to be tweaked slightly, but did not constitute a major change.

**Preliminary Shoreline Use Matrix**

The next topic is the matrix, highlighting the changes. One of the issues was trying to make the matrix more user-friendly.

People often wonder what the difference is between shoreline uses and shoreline modifications. State law defines shoreline uses as things such as a marina and a shoreline modification would be dredging for the marina as an example.

A few items being proposed to add or change to the existing matrix are:

- Floating homes and house boats
- Industrial uses
- Log storage
- Current table says transient accommodations the new table uses tourist accommodations
- Navigational signs
- Shoreline stabilization will replace bulkheads.

**Resource Management and Extraction**

Aquaculture within districts are subject to shoreline conditional use permits and it is being proposed for the aquatic to have it just require a standard shoreline development permit, meaning a simpler process to encourage aquaculture.

Forest Practices – under the Natural it is being proposed to possibly prohibit forest practices (5000 board feet or greater) in the Natural designation. This is not referring to the simple clearing and grading, but substantial cutting.

Commissioner Hillers wondered if there was a massive blow down would this type of prohibition on the size of clearing be an issue.
Ms. Stewart replied a timber salvage operation in the event of a storm related blow down could be exempt from this prohibition if the Planning Commission wished to add such language. More restrictions for forest practices are being considered because under the emphasis of no net loss, State studies show vegetation conservation is really important in the shoreline area. To the extent to can keep the trees and the ground cover provides better habitat and keeps the slopes more stable.

Another change for the Natural designation is to prohibit mining within the natural shoreline designation. It is currently allowed, subject to a conditional use permit.

**Transportation**
Bridges do not show on this matrix as a shoreline use, but will need to be included. For places like Snakelum Point where there is a bridge to go out to the spit; it is all under shoreline jurisdiction. A discussion on what the bridge may need to look like to be as compatible as possible will need to occur.

**Tourist Accommodations**
This draft is proposing to be more open to the possibility of hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts, inns, and country inns locating in shoreline jurisdiction. It reflects the fact that the islands are in part a tourist economy. There may be some areas within shoreline jurisdiction that are suitable for these types of uses. With a conditional use permit a site specific consideration could be taken.

Restricting these uses outright seemed unnecessary and contradictory to the Shoreline Management Act’s terms of water dependant uses and water enjoyment uses. It is something that is supposed to be promoted in these shoreline programs.

**Signs**
Navigational signs were added in this category. The two categories that exist within the current program are off premises and on premises directional signs, the proposed change is that the aquatic signs don’t really need to be in the water. Right now they are listed as shoreline conditional use permits and it is proposed to prohibit these in the water.

A discussion by the Commission of specifics on the definitions of particular types of signs was stated would be helpful.

Ms. Stewart agreed that there should be more specifics as to what the new navigational sign definition is as well as including it in the glossary and having sign standards for these signs. The existing categories should already be included.

**Shoreline Modifications**
The existing matrix did not have bulkheads addressed properly, so this has been corrected. Shoreline stabilization will need to address more than just bulkheads in the documents however.

Under groins and jetties, the proposed matrix would have these listed as conditional use permits as these are discouraged due to the fact that they disrupt the sediment transport.
Landfill and grading for the Natural designation is proposed to be changed from a prohibited use to needing a conditional use permit. Restoration projects have had a hard time in the Natural environment to do what is needed.

Commissioner Howard asked if there are any questions, hearing none

*Commissioner Hillers moved to adjourn, Commissioner Yonkman seconded, motion carried unanimously.*

Meeting adjourned at 11:29 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Paula Bradshaw