

PLANNING COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION - SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM  
November 4, 2004 - 7 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Bob Bernd, Henry Wood, Jim Liebrecht, Tor Hartman, Rick Penhallurick, Dean Kastanis, and Todd Lengenfelder Absent: Yvonne Parker

Staff Present: Anne Henning, Lori Barlow, and Judy Thompson

The study session was called in order to discuss the Shoreline Master Program.

Anne Henning, Associate Planner, distributed an Introduction to Washington's Shoreline Management Act, a draft outline of the Shoreline Master Program, proposed goals for the Shoreline Master Program, and a draft of general policies. Ms. Henning stated that the waters of the lake belong to all residents of the state and need to be regulated for the benefit of everyone. The city adopted its Shoreline Master Plan in 1974 and the last update was in 1988. The existing Shoreline Master Plan is outdated. It needs to be updated and integrated with the Comprehensive Plan. She mentioned that the new state guidelines indicate that there is to be no net loss of shoreline function. This will require consideration of the cumulative effect of shoreline development.

There was considerable discussion concerning the fact that shoreline development is only one aspect of water quality and how the city can reconcile no net loss of shoreline function along the lake shore with activities taking place in the lake that affect the lake shore.

Ms. Henning pointed out that water quality is a concern of the Department of Ecology and is being looked at through other programs. She mentioned that shoreline planning is partly the responsibility of the city and partly the responsibility of the state. The state determines the end result and leaves it up to the local jurisdictions to provide the means to achieve that result.

Lori Barlow, Associate Planner, pointed out that the new shoreline master program will be a tool that will make it easier for staff and the Planning Commission to inform property owners what type of development can be constructed or is encouraged along the lake shore.

Sandra Strieby, of Highlands and Associates, stated that she will draft the plan, taking into account the local concerns and interests. She mentioned that Central Washington University has completed the inventory and is in the process of analyzing the information. When the analysis is completed, the information will be used to determine the current state of the lake. There is not requirement to return the lake to a pristine condition, but the current state should be maintained or, if possible, improved. Since the Department of Ecology must approve the final plan, she is keeping them informed and providing them with drafts. The work that was done by the city's Shoreline Advisory Committee was the starting point for the current draft.

Ms. Henning pointed out that the goals from the Committee were three pages long. Those goals have been condensed and some of them have been moved to the policy section of the new plan. She mentioned that the proposed Economic Development Policies, the Critical Areas Policies 1 and 2, the Wetlands Policies, the Aquifer Recharge Areas Policies, the Frequently Flooded Areas Policies, the Geologically Hazardous Areas Policies, and the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas Policies are new; the Archaeological and Historic Resources Policies, the Environmental Impacts and Water Quality Policies, the Critical Areas Policies 3, 4, and 5, the Parking Policies, the Public Access Policies, the Signage Policies, the Utilities Policies, and the Vegetation Conservation Policies are the same as proposed by the Committee.

The Commission reviewed the draft goals as follows:

Economic Development Goal: Provide for economically productive industrial and commercial uses that are particularly dependent on shoreline location or use and that will support the local economy and foster healthy, orderly economic growth.

No changes

Public Access Goal: Provide, protect, and enhance physical and visual public access to shorelines, the waters they encompass, and adjacent shoreline areas, consistent with the natural character, features, and resources of the shoreline, provide property rights, and the public safety.

No changes

Recreation Goal: Provide for the preservation and enlargement of public and private recreational use of shorelines and the waters they encompass for both active and passive recreation in areas that will be able to accommodate such uses now and in the future without net loss of shoreline functions, and where recreational use is compatible with adjacent uses.

No changes

Circulation Goal: A safe, reasonable, and adequate circulation system, including major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other public utilities and facilities, correlated with existing and planned land use patterns and designed to have the least possible adverse effect on shoreline resources, including unique or fragile shoreline features, existing ecological systems, public access, and visual resources; and where feasible to contribute to the functional and visual enhancement of those resources.

Change as follows:

~~Circulation~~ Transportation Goal: A safe, reasonable, and adequate traffic circulation system, ~~including major thoroughfares, transportation routes, terminals, and other public utilities and facilities, correlated with existing and planned land use patterns and designed to have the least possible adverse effect on shoreline resources, including unique or fragile shoreline features, existing ecological systems, public access, and visual resources;~~ and where feasible contribute to the functional and visual enhancement of those resources.

Shoreline Use Goal: Provide for reasonable and appropriate use of shoreline and adjacent land areas while protecting against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life; minimizing damage to the ecology, environment, and other resources of the shoreline area; minimizing any interference with the public's use of the water, and recognizing and protecting private property rights consistent with the public interest.

There was some discussion and the Commission felt this was confusing, unnecessary, and should be eliminated, since the Master Program addresses shoreline use. Whatever this goal was intended to address should be addressed in the other goals.

The consensus was that this goal should be eliminated.

~~Shoreline Use Goal: Provide for reasonable and appropriate use of shoreline and adjacent land areas while protecting against adverse effects to the public health, the land and its vegetation and wildlife, and the waters of the state and their aquatic life; minimizing damage to the ecology, environment, and other resources of the shoreline area; minimizing any interference with the public's use of the water, and recognizing and protecting private property rights consistent with the public interest.~~

Conservation Goal: Preservation and restoration of natural resources of shorelines and the waters they encompass, and protection of those resources against adverse impacts, including loss of ecological functions necessary to sustain the natural resources. Natural resources include but are not limited to scenic vistas and other natural aesthetic resources, fish and wildlife habitat, including shoreline vegetation and wetlands associated with shorelines, soils, (add to this list as appropriate based on inventory and analysis).

There was some discussion and it was felt that "natural resources" could be included in the definitions rather than listed in this goal.

Conservation Goal: Preservation and restoration of natural resources of shorelines and the waters they encompass, and protection of those resources against adverse impacts, including loss of ecological functions necessary to sustain the natural resources. ~~Natural resources include but are not limited to scenic vistas and other natural aesthetic resources, fish and wildlife habitat, including shoreline vegetation and wetlands associated with shorelines, soils, (add to this list as appropriate based on inventory and analysis);~~

Historic, Cultural, Scientific, and Educational Goal: Identify, protect, and restore important archaeological, historical, and cultural structures, sites, and areas and other resources having historic, cultural, or educational values that are located in the shorelands of the state for educational, scientific, and enjoyment uses of the general public.

There was some discussion and the Commission did not feel that restoration of a site should be required.

Historic, Cultural, Scientific, and Educational Goal: Identify and protect ~~and restore~~ important archaeological, historical, and cultural structures, sites, and areas and other resources having historic, cultural, or educational values that are located in the ~~state~~ shoreline area for educational, scientific, and enjoyment uses of the general public.

Flood Protection Goal: Minimize flood damage in shoreline areas and associated waters, including damage resulting from actions outside shoreline areas.

No changes.

The next study session was set for Monday, November 8, 2004 at 6:30 p.m. in the Council Chambers.

The study session was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.