

Shoreline Master Program
SAG Meeting June 27, 2007
Caucus Representatives
Jerry Barnes – Agriculture
Raleigh Chinn – Business/recreation
Lee Bernheisel – Environment / Conservation
Jon Wyss – Natural Resources
Absent – Wendy Witt – Homeowners / Property Owners

Introductions

Review Agenda

Lee Bernheisel voiced his displeasure that the website was not up to date, stating that the County should provide adequate staff for the planning process. Char explained that the status of the website is an interdepartmental matter. The County has committed staff to the project. Lee also stated that he does not like receiving comments via email, it appears to give special standing to those comments, and stated that he wished Chris Johnson was at the meeting because he has issues with Chris' comments on the draft goals and policies.

Kurt Danison stated that the reason the goals and policies had been emailed out and comments requested was so that we would have an opportunity to compile all comments prior to the meeting and so that people that were unable to attend the meeting would have an opportunity to comment.

Jeremy Pratt stated that he felt that if people sent in comments they should attend the meeting to discuss the comments.

Clynda Case suggested that comments not just say what doesn't work, there should be alternatives suggested or answers provided as to what would work.

Jerry Barnes stated that unless you are a professional meeting attendee, you can't get it all done. Jerry also felt that the document needed more wordsmithing or editing prior to being sent out to the members.

Clynda announced that Chelan County had received funding for their Shoreline update as well as to start watershed planning for WRIA 47.

Jeremy asked if everyone had received an agenda and had a chance to review. Jeremy then suggested that the group review the goals then go back and go through the policies.

Lee said that this is a laundry list and has rules mixed with goals, he feels that rules should be in the environment portion of the document. Some or all are optional, (ie; where appropriate) some may not be appropriate for Okanogan County due to its rural

nature and density. We are not a city and will not have the development that a city will. We need to focus on where Okanogan County needs to be.

Jeremy said that these goals and policies are meant to be general, one of the things on the table is whether all should apply or not.

Kurt stated that Okanogan County's current Shoreline Master Program does not have a goals and policies section, he found existing goals and policies in other jurisdictions and didn't decide on his own what would be appropriate in Okanogan County, that's why we are here we want a regional plan, not 5 different plans for the county and 4 participating cities. Some belong in more specific designations. Ideally what we do will be generally applicable with more tailoring later in the process.

Lee said that we need to figure out what we are dealing with, but to have everyone under the same rules won't work. They are too general but also too specific. This is a laundry list not applicable to Okanogan County, just cities. The document is too long.

Vicky Welch said in terms of organization we need to decide on designations first then move on to the goals and policies.

Kurt said that we started with six or seven basic designations, we are just starting inventory and analysis, what we end up with may or may not be what we have today. Jumping into designations would be premature before inventory and analysis is complete.

Jeremy said we are working on basic framework. Staff will send the draft framework to SAG members.

Raleigh Chinn said if we look and the Shoreline Master Program in unincorporated areas like outside Oroville, is our process going to include municipalities as well as the whole county.

Kurt said that cities can pre-designate in the update but can't in the current plan.

Sandra Strieby encouraged SAG members to think carefully about policies. They lay the groundwork for designations and other regulations, and should reflect the County's intentions. Designation criteria are regulatory and would be the appropriate place for designation-specific language. We need to discuss what policy is and what it should do.

Clynda said what a policy is "shoulds" regulations are "shalls"

Kurt said some of this should clear itself up as we go along.

Sandra agreed with Clynda that a policy is an expression of desire.

Lee said it is important to break apart goals and policies between shorelines of the state and shorelines of statewide significance as these have different regulatory needs and we

haven't gotten into what is shoreline of the state and what is shoreline of statewide significance. This goes to the heart of what goals are for this body. Policies are more difficult and more regulatory. Policy is more rule or regulation.

Kurt said we don't need redundancy, not 14 pages of repetitive language.

Rocklynn Culp stated that a couple years ago the RTPO took all their goals and policies and put them on a single 11 x 17 sheet, it helps keep it simple and reduces redundancy, she feels this would be a good end goal.

Kurt said that there are 6 recommended designations in the Shoreline Management Act – Natural, Rural Conservancy, Aquatic, High Intensity, Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential. The county is currently 80% rural.

Clynda said that Lee made an important point, his concern is rural maybe we should direct meetings toward specific designations.

Jon Wyss said that as we go through some inventory and analysis it is important to remember that there are large land owners whose intent is to never release the land.

Jeremy said now we are going to get into the goals.

General Goal #1

Raleigh said that he is concerned with the word development regarding development of shoreline areas.

Kurt said that the goal is focused on protection.

Jerry said development has to be there or why are we here?

Lee said the conflict is not easily solved, it is important to get designations correct and do everything we can to protect the environment.

Jeremy asked how will we develop, protect and enhance?

Sandra wondered if "development" should change to "use" so that there is a broader look at what might be happening.

Jeremy said the goals should be broader.

Raleigh said something is going to happen in court, the word use might be better.

The word "Use" was added to goal #1.

Goal #2 had no changes

Economic Goal #2

Lee felt was too subjective – cut least possible adverse – eliminate that statement.

Vicky felt it was too redundant.

Economic Goal #1 & 2 were changed to “ensure healthy, orderly economic growth by providing for economically productive water oriented industrial and commercial uses that are particularly dependent on shoreline location.

Public Access Goal #1

”Struck shorelines, the waters they encompass , and adjacent”

Recreation Goal #1

Vicky suggested a paragraph regarding incompatible uses.

Recreation Goal #1 & 2 were combined to “Provide for public and private active and passive recreational use of shoreline areas.”

The introduction to the plan will contain issues of no net loss, least possible adverse, and compatibility.

Lee suggested doing an elevation inventory as well.

Next meeting scheduled for July 25, 2007.