

Shoreline Master Program
SAG Meeting August 27, 2008

Caucus Representatives

John Umberger- Property Owners
Jerry Barnes – Agriculture
Raleigh Chinn – Business/recreation
Lee Bernheisel – Environment / Conservation
Jon Wyss – Natural Resources
Absent Chris Johnson – City of Okanogan
Absent George Brady – Town of Pateros
Chris Branch – Cities of Tonasket and Oroville
Dolores Castillo – Colville Confederated Tribes
Vicky Welch – Methow Watershed Council
Dave Acheson – Town of Winthrop
Absent Ralph Malone - City of Omak
Absent – Town of Brewster

Alternate for Environment/Conservation: Jason Paulson

Alternate for City of Okanogan: Craig Nelson

Alternate for Business/Recreation: Angel Lund

Guests: Angel and Mark Lund, Charlie Ballard

Staff: Angie Hubbard, Okanogan County; Jeremy Pratt, ENTRIX, Inc. (facilitator);
Kurt Danison, Sandra Strieby and Sarah Schrock, Highlands Associates

Member reports:

None

Kurt explained that the team has not been able to finalize the shoreline characterization...ENTIRX and Ecology are working on ecological function.

Use Chart-Presented by Kurt:

Angel-The draft use chart has commercial related mining and not small scale mining. I would like small scale mining to be added. We are already heavily regulated by other agencies including the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife with the Gold and Fish Pamphlet.

Chris Branch-We should define small scale mining.

Kurt-This will need to be addressed and we will revise the use chart.

Bernie-Why do we need an aquatic designation for waterward of the ordinary high water mark? You cannot build there anyway.

Chris B-There are various recreational activities that could take place in the aquatic environment.

Bernie-Isn't the designation unnecessary because the state has jurisdiction anyway.

(Discussion of potential need, with Kurt, Chris B., and Jon contributing. Chris suggested keeping all of the designations for now, then deleting any for which there is no use.)

Bernie-Cities come up with UGA boundaries. There is joint administration under the Growth Management Act (GMA). We need some distinction of what those boundaries are. Designations should be appropriate to environmental functions, even if within a UGA.

Kurt-. How land in UGAs is designated will be partly up to the cities—what designation to apply where. There are only three designations that are allowed only within UGA's. They are High Intensity, Shoreline Residential, and Urban Conservancy. Management will be in part a function of administration.

Chris B: County and cities are talking about UGAs, UGA criteria, pre-designation.

Kurt-The County will set up UGA's with facilities plans. Then when the city annexes land we will need to have a designation in place so that there is not a problem when that takes place.

Agricultural uses

John U-How do we protect and restore open space? Kurt-It depends where you apply restoration. Restoration will not be to a historical level but rather the baseline condition that it is in today so the ecological function will not deteriorate beyond what it is like today.

Lee-How does that fit in with High Intensity Agriculture? Sandra-Agriculture would not necessarily be allowed everywhere; whether it would be allowed depends in part on whether it is High or Low Intensity. We are not talking about existing agriculture but rather land that would be converted into new agriculture.

What will happen if a farmer decides to change his crop from one year to the next?

Jon: do you think there should be more than one ag type; this should be well thought out.

Vicky-categories could be confusing...agricultural use intensities change from year to year. One year you may be allowed the next year you may not be allowed. Perhaps the word intensity could be replaced with something more flexible. There could be unique performance standards associated with the impact on the shoreline environment and ecosystem function.

Jon Wyss-I see a loophole if we can apply for the highest intensity, What about mixed use Ag? What about farm worker housing in the shoreline and the density standards?

Chris Branch-The CUP process could be like a farming plan, with uses described.

Craig Nelson-It is not the intensity that degrades the shoreline environment but rather the management of the agriculture that leads to the impact it has on the shoreline environment.

Lee-look at the structure of the existing SMP. This is confusing and more restrictive for agriculture.

Kurt-Agriculture should be allowed. Environment specific regulations address restrictions.

Dave-A Conditional Use Permit would analyze this on a case by case basis through the public process.

Chris B: with a CUP, you would have criteria by which to measure.

Jason-We need to look carefully at the guidelines. What process do we want to have for new agriculture in the shoreline environment? (The regulations in the use chart do not apply on existing Ag land—apply to new uses, conversion of non-agricultural land.

Boating facilities, docks, etc.

Jerry-boating regulations should be similar to those in other eastern Washington counties.

Lee- A shoreline development permit required for a boat ramp would not matter if it cost \$1000 they would not be required to get one.

Jerry-Is this significantly different than other Eastern Washington Counties. Kurt-we are probably similar but we may not end up with these designations at the end.

John U-Paragraph #4 on page 9 needs to be consistent with use chart.

Jason-Boat lifts and docks should have consistent regulations; think through the administrative process. . Sandra-you may want to allow docks in some places that boatlifts would not be allowed. Lee: Docks impede navigation, need public review. Kurt: make sense of...have never written an exemption for a dock.

Jerry-Most of the docks fall under another agency's review.

Commercial Uses

Lee-We have not discussed lot size, setbacks, etc.

Recreational uses

Dave-It is confusing to have boat launches and docks in different places. Vicky-We should combine Recreation, Boating, and docks, make regulations consistent.

Lump all intensities together; permit conditions depend on proposed use and its impacts.

Kurt: staff will make changes to use chart based on tonight's meeting, send for SAG members to mark up—about two weeks from now.

Dave-Trails are also confusing.

Lee-We need more thought to see if something should be allowed rather than permitting uses by CUP. Setbacks would be helpful to make these decisions.

Lee: make development standards simple.

Lee, Sarah: development standards in same chart as uses.

Wrap up

Kurt

- Within one month, and maybe as soon as one or two weeks, Ecology is expected to buy off on science.
- AUs are being consolidated; have draft characterization; cannot finalize until have science piece; hope to send as next piece for SAG to look at
- Next meeting, 10/1,
- Ecology must change timelines. Expect complete draft after 1st of year

Lee: map would be useful. Show existing designations.