

**WHITMAN COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
February 1, 2023  
Auditorium Public Service Building  
Available by Zoom  
7:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS:**

Chad Whetzel, Chairman  
Mark Tolman  
Weston Kane  
David Tysz

Brian Davies, Vice-Chairman  
Dave Gibney  
Matt Webb

**Staff:** Alan Thomson, WC Planning Director; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

**Others:** Shelly Chambers Fox, Ken Duft.

**7:00 p.m.** – Chad Whetzel called the meeting to order. Introductions were held.

**MOTION** by Brian Davies to approve and Weston Kane seconded the minutes from November 2, 2022. Motion passed.

**Reports:**

Alan Thomson:

- a. Board of Adjustment forthcoming hearings – I wrote this before the hearing. The Board of Adjustment forthcoming hearings, the conditional use for the adult family home in Steptoe, was approved last week. It is in the appeal period time right now.
- b. Forthcoming Administrative Use Permits – None.
- c. Update on previous conditional use permits and variances – We had a variance for Sam Young, Stoneway Electric side setback variance and it was approved on November 2, 2023. Then we had a conditional use permit for a canine behavioral training center and that was approved on November 2, 2023.
- d. Update on previous administration use permits – None.
- e. Board of County Commissioners’ action – None.
- f. Update on previous Board of County Commissioners’ action - We do have an update on the BOCC actions regarding the zoning code amendments that we all went through. All of those were approved on November 21, 2022.

- g. Forthcoming Shoreline of the State Substantial Development Permits – None.
- h. Update on previous Shoreline of the State Substantial Development permits – None.
- i. Planning Commission forthcoming hearings – We have a hearing set for the Shoreline update and that is February 15, 2023, in front of the Planning Commission.

**7:07 p.m. – Adjourned.**

**WHITMAN COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION WORKSHOP  
February 1, 2023  
Auditorium Public Service Building  
Available by Zoom  
7:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS:**

Chad Whetzel, Chairman  
Mark Tolman  
Weston Kane  
David Tysz

Brian Davies, Vice-Chairman  
Dave Gibney  
Matt Webb

**Staff:** Alan Thomson, WC Planning Director; Grace Di Biase, WC Assistant Planner; Brandon Johnson, Public Works; Elinor Huber, Clerk.

**Others:** Shelly Chambers Fox, Ken Duft

**7:12 p.m.** – Chad Whetzel called the meeting to order. Introductions were held.

Alan Thomson – We can move on to unfinished business. The consultant is going to present the draft of the SMP update.

Rachel Granrath – Hi, everyone. Thanks for spending tonight and the day after Valentines' Day to talk about Shorelines. It is very exciting. I heard a little bit of conversation as we started surrounding that link being sent out. Has everyone seen the draft of the SMP? Would you like me to share my screen and show you what we have got for our final draft?

David Tysz – You will have to bring it up because it wouldn't load on mine.

Rachel Granrath – Okay. Can everyone see my screen? Okay. For purposes tonight I will walk you through the Whitman County document. There are obviously a few more with the local jurisdictions that are participating in this coalition so, each of you that are in your participating areas, Tekoa, for example is one, maybe you want to look at that with a fine-tooth comb.

This is a joint hearing that we are holding with Ecology. Ecology will be present as well, from their perspectives to give an overview of what the Shoreline Management Act is, why we do this and answer any questions at the State level behalf on Ecology. But it is for all of the documents with the cities and counties that are participating in this coalition.

For tonight, I will walk through WC's and show you the changes. Pretty much across the board, everything is the same. There is a lot of, some minor differences on how we treat the shoreline in each jurisdiction, but for purposes of our plan and making sure we are consistent with state and federal regulations, the changes are all going to be the same across all of the plans. You can just stop me and ask questions as we go.

I figured instead of walking through the checklist, I will show you through the document where we have made changes and go from there. You can ask questions as we go along. A lot of it was formatting so I'm not going to highlight that stuff. I will just look at the content regulations.

### **19.63.105 APPLICABILITY**

*6. Areas and uses in those areas that are under exclusive federal jurisdiction as established through federal or state statutes are not subject to the jurisdiction of chapter 90.58 RCW.*

Rachel Granrath – This change right here is adding an exception to the Shoreline Master Program processes for exclusively federal jurisdictions as is referenced in the State's RCW's and defined at the State level through federal or state statutes.

Alan and I have gone back and forth on this about a concern relating to a lot of lands that the Corps of Engineers owns along the Snake River. Alan, I believe you got feedback directly from Ecology on that, correct? Do you want to address with the group what Ecology has said with regards to federal lands?

Alan Thomson – I can give an overview. I talked with Jeremy Sikes about this one because I was concerned about some property at the Snake River that is governed by the Port of Whitman. So, even though it is Corps owned, it is owned by the Corps and leased by the Port of Whitman. That is not subject to this.

The Corps couldn't pull a card out of their deck and say that we are excluding this from any of this process, any of these regulations because it is leased out by the Corps. It is not directly under jurisdiction of the Corps. That was my concern and so I was happy with that. I think that is fine.

Rachel Granrath – So, that is where the exclusive language comes in, Alan? It exclusively has to be owned.

Alan Thomson – Yes, if it is owned by the Corps and managed by the Corps, then it would be exempt.

Dave Gibney – Your sentence would flow better and match the rest of them if the word, "that" was after "state statutes" and before "are."

Rachel Granrath – Say that one more time.

Dave Gibney – Okay, it would be better if it read, "*Areas and uses in those areas that are under exclusive federal jurisdictions as established through federal or state statutes **that** are not subject .....*" It starts out as "*This SMP does not apply to the following activities,*" and then that last sentence doesn't flow the same as the others. But, I could be wrong.

Rachel Granrath – I'm okay with that if that's what,

Alan Thomson – Dave, I think the way it was originally written sounds better to me. What does everybody else think?

Brian Davies – I'm trying to consume it. So, *"SMP does not apply to the following: It does not apply to areas and uses in those areas that are under exclusive federal jurisdiction as established through federal or state statutes."* Maybe just end it right there and reference the RCW.

David Tysz – I guess I'm dumb on this. The Federal Government makes the rules that you have to follow and then it makes a statement it doesn't have to follow? What is that?

Alan Thomson – Don't go down that rabbit hole, Dave.

Brian Davies – It is just saying that these areas under federal jurisdiction as established through federal or state statutes are not subject to the jurisdiction of chapter, or are exempt, or whatever.

Rachel Granrath – Yes, and this is sample language that Ecology puts out. So, this is what they are urging us to use.

David Tysz – Why are they forcing me to do something when they can't do it?

Dave Gibney – The reason, I think that sentence gets awkward about the point where that cursor is. I find it valuable to reference the chapter that they are not subject to the jurisdiction of, but it's a partial sentence from there on.

Chad Whetzel – If you go back to the start of that sentence where it says, "Areas and uses,"

Dave Gibney – The sentence starts with, *"This SMP does not apply to the following activities."*

Chad Whetzel – Right. So, *"Areas and uses,"* it is just super redundant. *"Areas and uses in those areas under exclusive federal jurisdiction as established through federal or state statute are not subject...."* You can delete that *"are"* it would flow better, I think.

David Tysz – If this was brought to a legal thing in court and a judge and jury or whatever was looking at it, what would they say on that statement?

Alan Thomson – It complies with state and federal law.

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

David Tysz – Okay.

Dave Gibney – Go on.

Rachel Granrath – Well, and you guys don't have to approve anything tonight. This is just walking you through the document and I would urge you while we have Ecology with us next time to ask some of these questions.

David Tysz – That's a good idea.

Dave Gibney – I know what it is saying. It doesn't, the way that it is written, it doesn't flow well.

Alan Thomson – You understand what it is saying.

Dave Gibney – Of course.

Rachel Granrath – Okay, we can flag that and a conversation for the hearing too, and get Ecology to weigh in as well.

Chad Whetzel – We could always forward this to the Department of redundancy department.

Mark Tolman – My question is how verbatim is Ecology passing this language on to you? Is this a quote?

Rachel Granrath – Most of what Ecology puts out there is sample language that they prefer for us to use for compliance. So, for the most part, we have followed the standard set for compliance with them. If we want to change things, we absolutely can, as long as the general content is here, as in we referenced the RCW and basically say that federal jurisdiction is exempt.

Alan Thomson – If you don't like the grammar, we can change the grammar as long as the intent and the meaning doesn't change.

Rachel Granrath – So, if you have ideas, I think again, if you have some ideas on specific language we have here, we can come back and draft some language, if you would like. I'm fine with that as long as the intent is here.

Mark Tolman – I would leave that to others.

### **19.63.108 EFFECTIVE DATE**

*The SMP is hereby adopted on the 16<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2015. This SMP and all amendments thereto shall become effective 14 days from the date of the Washington State Department of Ecology's written notice of final approval.*

Rachel Granrath – Okay, all of these SMP documents have an effective date and adoption. We will update this as we go through the process, have our hearing and then ultimately each jurisdiction adopts the ordinance. That will be reflected here when Ecology formally adopts the plan. That will be the last thing we do.

### **19.63.200 DEFINITIONS**

*5. Dismantling or removing structures if there is no other associated development or re-development.*

Rachel Granrath – This is when we have changes in these areas, this is definitely sampling from Ecology and sometimes from the Feds as it relates to floodplains. The first change that we had to add here is under the definition of development. We added #5 which describes, "Dismantling or removing structures if there is no other associated development or re-development."

That is talking about what development is not defined as. If you take down something, or remove something and there is nothing else going in its place, that is exempt from development permits. So, it is just clarifying that. Some of these were just grammar and stuff, not changing content.

Okay, so this doesn't really apply to you guys. I don't think we have any floating homes or houseboats but I will defer to Alan on that. But state regulations do require us to have a definition in all of our SMPs and so we have updated this to read what the State requires us to have, which is, now reads as:

**House boat or floating home.** *Means a vessel or any floating structure other than a floating home, as defined by this chapter: (a) that is designed or used primarily as a residence on the water and has detachable utilities; and (b) whose owner or primary occupant has held an ownership interest in space in a marina, or has held a lease or sublease to use space in a marina, since a date prior to July 1, 2014.*

Rachel Granrath – So, in this case we are not allowing new floating homes unless they pre-date from 2014.

Okay, so we have some thoughts here. Alan, when we last talked, we have three different definitions as it relates to conforming, non-conforming. So, we have a definition on non-conforming lots, we have a definition on non-conforming use, and then we have a definition on non-conforming structures or development.

That means essentially means grandfathering something in. Things that wouldn't be permitted today but existed before and so lawfully established at that time, but wouldn't again be permitted today.

**Non-conforming lots.** *An undeveloped lot, tract, parcel, site, or division of land located landward of the OHWM which was established in accordance with local and state subdivision requirements prior to the effective date of the Act or this Master Program, but which does not conform to the present lot size standards, may be developed if permitted by other land use regulations of the County and so long as development conforms to all other requirements of this Master Program and the Act.*

**Non-conforming Use.** *An existing shoreline use that was lawfully established prior to the effective date of the act or the applicable master program, but which does not conform to present use regulations due to subsequent changes to the master program.*

**Non-conforming Use or Structure/Development.** *A building or structure or land use which was lawfully established, existing and maintained at the effective date of the provisions of this Chapter but which, because of the application of this Chapter to it, is no longer fully consistent with present regulations such as setbacks, buffers or yards; area; bulk; height or density standards due to subsequent changes to the master program. ~~No longer conforms to the regulations prescribed in this Chapter for the use district or shoreline environment designation which it is located.~~*

There was some language that was recommended by Ecology for us to change to be more compliant with the RCWs and that is what is being proposed here. Alan, I believe when we had conversations on this, we were trying to make this a little more useable?

Alan Thomson – Yes, one of my concerns was that the original language that we are going to eliminate needs to be in there and struck out. I'm not sure if this was the particular place but there are some other places coming up that there have been certain things. But you have missed the language that was there originally and that still needs to be in there and indicating that we are striking that. I think you have it ok here because you are adding new things.

Chad Whetzel – What is the OHWM under Non-conforming?

Alan Thomson – Ordinary high-water mark

Rachel Granrath – That is an acronym as defined right here, which is the ordinary high-water mark.

Alan Thomson – So, just to make it clear, the language that is in green, is that additional language?

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

Alan Thomson – Is it green on your screen?

Rachel Granrath – Yes, it is green on mine and it usually depends on who did the work. So, anything that is a different color means someone has changed it.

Alan Thomson – So, that is language that is getting added to the original document, correct?

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

Dave Gibney – You can see over to the side what Justin deleted.

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

Dave Gibney – It's not the right format for you know, the legislative bill change but,

Alan Thomson – That was the point I was making to Rachel that any language, original language that was getting deleted needs to be shown in there. If "or" is being deleted, it needs to be in there and struck out.

Rachel Granrath – Yes, and I think we have that in this section. I'm going through the original SMP as we are talking. Yes, that is all tracked here. Are you ready to keep going?

***Substantial development –***

*Any development of which the total cost or fair market value exceeds \$8504, or any development which materially interferes with the normal public use of the water or shorelines of the state.*

When we talk about your substantial development, this is your substantial development permit processes. There is a threshold, a dollar amount and that has increased this last year to \$8,504. That is basically if you have a project that is less than that amount then you are exempt from obtaining a substantial development permit.



That price change is based on lots of things and probably will go up again because of inflation here pretty soon. That amount changes over time so this is the latest amount the State has come out with for fair market values for development along the shorelines. That again, is exempt.

Chad Whetzel – Is that number higher than the original?

Rachel Granrath – Correct.

Chad Whetzel – That number that is deleted is the number that actually doesn't exist because there's not enough commas. That number is way higher than what the \$8,000 was so I don't know if it was actually deleted.

Alan Thomson – That needs to be in the final document, that number that we are deleting and it was somewhere around \$6,000-7,000.

Dave Gibney – It was probably \$76, 004.4176.

Rachel Granrath – Here's the number, \$6,416.

Alan Thomson – That will be in the final document, struck out and then the new number in there.

Rachel Granrath – Looks like that is all we had in definition changes. Okay, next one.

### **19.63.303 ADMINISTRATION**

- 1. Permit review time for projects on a state highway Pursuant to RCW 47.01.485, the Legislature established a target of 90 days review for local governments.*

Okay, let's say Alan gets an application for some work on one of your state highways. WSDOT has that target for 90 days so if there are shoreline implications, we have to hold to a certain timeline. Which, in general, I think, 90 days is usually something we can make our review times in. But again, it sets a target for those state highway projects.

Chad Whetzel – So, if the target is 90 days, what is their actual maximum?

Rachel Granrath – I'm not sure if they have a maximum or how much teeth that has with the 90-day review but, I think it gives the State a little more leeway to hold communities to a timeline.

Chad Whetzel – Well, so this is their review of our project, correct?

Dave Gibney – No, that is Alan's review of their project.

Alan Thomson – I have 90 days to get it done.

Chad Whetzel – That's not what it says, though. It says you have approximately 90 days.

Dave Gibney – I'm sure that RCW has a few teeth to,

Chad Whetzel – That is not what it says in the code right there.

Alan Thomson – I would refer to the RCW and look and see what it says in there, but 90 days is way beyond the time frame that it takes me to get something done.

Chad Whetzel – I realize that, but that is not what it says there. So, I don't know what the code actually says.

Rachel Granrath – The language that we put here is guidance from Ecology and it is not, the RCW is right here and it basically says:

*(1) To the greatest extent, practicable a city, town, code city or county must make a final determination on all permits required for a permit for a project on a state highway as defined in this RCW no later than ninety days after the department's submission of a complete permit application for a project with an estimated cost of less than five hundred million dollars.*

Chad Whetzel – So, the code should say “within ninety days”, not a “target of ninety days.”

Rachel Granrath – But it also says, “*To the greatest extent practicable.*” So, it's not, it has some leeway for us. I don't know if we want to target ourselves in one way or another.

Chad Whetzel – If the State is happy with it, then they can have it.

Alan Thomson – If it were way beyond ninety days, I think we would be taken to task on it. If it were a few days over, my guess would be it would be no big deal. It is a target. It is going to be way beyond the amount of time I would need to get this done, anyway.

Mark Tolman – I would think something far more complicated was going on if you get it down to that point.

Rachel Granrath – At least the RCW says the time of a complete application. So that ninety days doesn't start until Alan issues a letter of complete application.

Alan Thomson – Typically in WC it is within a month and a half to get this kind of thing done. A substantial development permit no more than a month and a half.

Brian Davies – I know that Mark isn't here, but Alan, do we have much county highway or county roads that border or do we have state highways that border shorelines?

Alan Thomson – We sure do. The whole Snake River.

Brian Davies – How much of the Snake River has a roadway that goes along it?

Chad Whetzel – From Lewiston to the Wawawai Landing from Boyer to past,

Alan Thomson – A lot of miles.

Dave Gibney – There are some little ones around Central Ferry.

Alan Thomson – The Palouse River. There are all kinds of shorelines that have roads, county roads for sure and some state routes. Most of the time it is an exception to an exemption to the shoreline master program, working within the perimeters of the existing roads. If they are expanding the roads, then that potentially triggers a shoreline substantial development permit, which takes a bit longer. But again, a month and a half to get through that process.

Brian Davies – Thank you.

Rachel Granrath – Good job, Alan and team.

Alan Thomson – Thanks.

Rachel Granrath – Okay, moving on.

### ***C. Exemptions Listed***

This section is updating the exemptions listed. This is cost threshold dealing with docks and so these dollar amounts have gone up as well. This looks like this wasn't called out specifically in your SMP before, so it is new language.

We also have an exemption for fish or wildlife habitat or fish passage. I think I mentioned that in our last meeting this came out of a lawsuit at the state level from tribal entities and basically making sure that salmon can reach the coast. So that was from, anyway, they are trying to incentivize those types of projects.

A lot of them are on the west side dealing with culvert enhancements to allow those fish to make it to the ocean because we've chopped up areas and not had continual streams. So, if you were to have a project that is enhancing fish passage then that could be exempt.

Then docks that don't exceed that dollar threshold are exempt and then we look at requirements for substantial development permits and what they don't apply to. So, those are things like looking at remedial action and there is an RCW that defines the areas that look at stormwater treatment and discharge and reducing pollutants and discharge.

WSDOT facilities and safety improvements. Again, there are certain projects that have to go through that streamline aspects so that ninety-day review with Alan, those are larger and not exempt, but there are some WSDOT facilities that are exempt.

Projects that are consistent with an RCW that looks at environmental excellence. So that is defined at the state level and projects authorized through energy facility site evaluation council process which has an associated RCW.

Also exempt, we look at forest practice that did not require a substantial development. So, it is timber cutting and activities defined by that WAC that is listed here.

Then the last one is external or internal retrofitting of existing structures with ADA access. So, that is if you are adding a ramp or retrofitting an existing facility for ADA access to allow for individuals with disability.

Chad Whetzel – Under V. What is the *“Projects authorized through the Energy Facility Site Evaluation Council process, pursuant to chapter 80.50 RCW.”*

Rachel Granrath – Do you want me to pull up the RCW?

Alan Thomson – That is EFSEC, so that is the State can intervene. For instance, with wind farms, they can take over local control for project that the State deems as very important for clean energy.

Chad Whetzel – So, basically, they can put that wherever they want.

Alan Thomson – It will go through a process but it is governed by the State not the local jurisdictions. It still gets reviewed.

Rachel Granrath – Good question, though.

Chad Whetzel – It gets reviewed by who?

Alan Thomson – The State of Washington, the Legislature, the Governor.

Chad Whetzel – So, and this is only in our critical areas, correct?

Rachel Granrath – Shoreline.

Alan Thomson – EFSEC applies to anywhere.

Chad Whetzel – That’s not exactly true, though, because if I remember correctly, well, and maybe things have changed, but that was the whole point of creating the code for wind energy was to decide where we wanted it and not have it everywhere.

Alan Thomson – That’s true, but certain projects, wind projects, for instance, have been deemed too important to maybe a local government and there’s state law that has been created for this, if they didn’t want to do it, then EFSEC steps in.

Dave Gibney – Had we not done that code, then they would have stepped in but,

Alan Thomson - They can still step in, Dave.

Chad Whetzel – (Inaudible)

Dave Gibney – Our code allows for it for unless our code says don’t, then they can step in, maybe. That’s what this thing is saying, too, is if our, really all this is saying, we can’t use this shoreline master plan to mess with something that came through this process. Because this is an exemption to the master plan.

Rachel Granrath – Requirements to obtain specific permits through WC’s jurisdiction is exempt. But there is State oversight, as Alan is saying. It is just not local control. Any other thoughts, here? Okay, you can always bring it up at the next meeting, too. This isn’t the final thing. Keep going.

### **19.63.307 NON-CONFORMING USES STRUCTURES LOTS**

So, remember when we were looking at definitions, talking about non-conforming uses, non-conforming structures, and non-conforming lots. These are again some updated language that is recommended and actually required by Ecology. So, this is consistent with some of the definitions that we updated, looking again, at your WC code references. Then updating your language here, accordingly for those referenced sections, as well.

We had deleted some of this and then re-added here. The areas that we referenced WC Code has been brought in and then clarifying areas of non-conforming uses and then this item 2 for non-conforming structures, which allows for a variance process and procedures to deem legal non-conforming or pre-existing non-conforming.

Mark Tolman – I like the term, “*recommended requirements.*”

Rachel Granrath – Any other thoughts on this one? Okay, moving along.

### **19.63.810 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

~~d. In accordance with WAC 173.26.241(j) new floating homes and liveaboards shall be prohibited.~~

*5. New ~~over-water~~ on-water residential developments are prohibited. Existing floating on-water residences legally established and moored within a marina with Whitman County prior to July 1, 2014, are considered a conforming use and should be accommodated through reasonable permit conditions, or mitigation that will not effectively preclude maintenance, repair, replacement, and remodeling of existing floating on-water residences and their moorages by rendering these actions impracticable. All replacements, and remodels which add one hundred twenty square feet or more to the living space, must require on-board gray-water containment or a waste-water connection that disposes of the gray water to a waste-water disposal system.*

If you remember back to the definitions, when we had to update that for what it looks like for new residential developments on the water. So, what you have taken as an entity is that you don’t want residential developments on your shorelines.

Essentially, anything new is prohibited and anything that existed before that 2014 date is non-conforming. So, it has to meet your non-conforming section for modifications or increased use or whatnot. So, that is what that is saying here. I assume you don’t want to allow for floating homes.

Dave Gibney – When did that happen?

Rachel Granrath – What, the 2014 change?

Dave Gibney – I guess, is it somewhere else on our code where it says you can’t do houseboats?

Rachel Granrath – It was in your definition section, so this area talks about regulations and you also have in your policies for residential developments that you want to prohibit new floating homes. That has existed. We are just clarifying the language along with the regulations as put forth for what is deemed non-conforming. I assume you don't want floating homes. You could change that if you wanted them. That's up to you.

Alan Thomson – There has been no demand for such a thing in my tenure here. So, Rachel, does this apply to elsewhere within the State of Washington?

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

Alan Thomson – So, places like Lake Chelan, for instance, where we know that there are houseboats in there. You can't put a new one in there now.

Rachel Granrath – Oh you can. There are regulations. It is a different set of laws. A whole different set of language. It is much easier if we take the path of prohibiting development. For places like Chelan and other areas, can have it.

David Tysz – I think when it covers that you can't live more than six months on the floating home.

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

Chad Whetzel – So, on this #5 where it says, *"New over-water residential developments are prohibited."* What is the definition of an over-water residential development?

Alan Thomson – A houseboat.

Rachel Granrath -Yes.

Chad Whetzel – So, that would be on the water, not over the water.

Alan Thomson – I think that is what that means. On the water.

Dave Gibney – What if I want to put it on stilts?

Chad Whetzel – When I first read this, that is what I actually envisioned, something that is actually built on the shoreline and hangs over the water.

Alan Thomson – I wouldn't interpret it that way.

Chad Whetzel – Because it is over the water, not on the water.

Alan Thomson – It is on the land.

Chad Whetzel – And over the water, versus actually on the water or in the water.

Alan Thomson – If you want to change that to be on the water?

Chad Whetzel – It makes more sense to when you go from that to the “*existing floating on-water residence.*”

David Tysz – Would the over the water one be like when they have pilings in the ground? So, it would be over the water?

Alan Thomson – Single family residences are allowed on the shorelines alongside these shoreline areas. You can build a single-family residence and you could potentially have a deck over the water but not on the water. But you may will be in a floodplain there, which is probably not going to fly.

David Tysz – If you look down further, about half way through it says, “*Replacements, remodeling of existing floating on-water residences.*” So, the top one the first part should be on-water.

Chad Whetzel – It says it three words into the second sentence after that, so it should be on-water, not over-water.

Rachel Granrath – Okay. Does everything else look good? Okay, that is what we have in the text.

I do have updated shoreline maps and there is a lot of them here in WC.

We have zoomed in on a couple of these to make it easier for you to use as well as updated your aerial imagery. For the content here, your designations haven’t changed so we aren’t changing the content. We are just making it more useable with the aerial data. Parcel information, so all of your cities, towns, county roads, etc., has been updated. There are a lot of them.

I am not going go to through them all, but you can see that we are following the county boundaries and looking at your shoreline designations and where those breaches are. As we talk about roads, here is a good example of some of the roads that are running through your shorelines.

We have some of them that are unincorporated that we are looking at. See here, there are developments along the side and where that shoreline kind of ebbs and flows. Each of these colors have different regulations associated with them so if someone comes to Alan and says that he would like to do X or Y here, Alan looks at, is it is in rural industrial port, and what are the regulations there and then works with the property owners.

We are just trying to make it easier for you in certain areas. This spans sometimes for large blocks of land and then you can see it is on either side. So, there are 50 of these sheets so there is a lot here. Each of the incorporated towns that have shorelines have their own zoomed in map that shows their parcel data as well.

Local jurisdictions have requested that we print maps for them and so we are going to do that and laminate as part of the process. So, Alan, maybe we should chat about what you would like as a county and what would help you there.

Alan Thomson – I was thinking that way we could talk about that.

Rachel Granrath – We just want it to be useful so, we got state money left so if we can print and make things look good and all that fun stuff, let’s do it.

Alan Thomson – Have you got an overall one of WC for the unincorporated area? It would be a 30,000 - foot view, just,

Rachel Granrath – It would be hard to see, but we could. We could try and print it super big.

Alan Thomson - We've got one from the previous time that is just a map of WC and then just highlighted the reaches of the shorelines. That is something that is really handy to have for me.

Rachel Granrath – Perfect, yes, we can do that. So, I will do an overall one for you, too, Alan.

Alan Thomson – Okay.

Rachel Granrath – And that's all I have. Those are the updates. So, they are not huge but, that is what we are taking about with Ecology.

Alan Thomson – Just to make it easier to find this document, David, for instance, go on to the County webpage. So, if you're having difficulty with your own personal computer and getting things up there, it is all on-line. You go to the Planning Department page and you can see the update there. So, it would be easier for you to review it online on the WC webpage.

Chad Whetzel – Also for anybody that is trying to join, there were a couple of people that said they were having a hard time finding the links. On the County page, if you go down to the bottom on the main screen, it has the different meetings and agendas. If you go to the Planning Commission agenda, then click on the agenda, the second page, there is always a link to zoom.

Alan Thomson – I always send this out with the agenda, so if you are not getting that, let me know. I usually do this a week or week and a half ahead of time. For instance, on the 15<sup>th</sup>, now question, do you have the link for the 15<sup>th</sup>? I've sent that out to you. David, do you have that?

Dave Gibney – When did you send that out?

Alan Thomson – A couple of weeks ago?

Dave Gibney – Is it the same link as tonight?

Alan Thomson – No, it is different one.

Dave Gibney – Well, I didn't see it. The only one I have is for tonight. I only have three other emails from you since then. None of which have that link in them. You might have sent it through Brandon and I'd have to look.

Chad Whetzel – The one that I have is from the first.

Alan Thomson – Okay, I will send it out again tomorrow but it is also on the webpage. If you can't find something from me, go to the webpage and get the information there. But I will send out the link again for the 15<sup>th</sup> tomorrow.



Then just to give you an update on the process, the other process for instance, the SEPA checklist. We've run the checklist and the 14-day comment period ends tomorrow. I haven't received any comments yet but Ecology could send something in tomorrow and then I will have to respond to that.

Then we are running, the State requires a 30-day comment period which is running right now and that is 30 days, and it is up on the 14<sup>th</sup> of February, the day before the hearing. So, that was published in the Gazette for two weeks and it is also on the webpage. So, that is running at the moment as well. That is state requirements that we are going through right now.

Then the hearing on the 15<sup>th</sup> so I will be sending you the normal stuff, the Findings of Fact, Conclusions, and that will be coming your way shortly.

Brian Davies – So, on the 15<sup>th</sup> all the comment periods will be done and we will be able to make a recommendation to the BOCC.

Alan Thomson – That is the objective, yes.

Brian Davies – Good timing.

Alan Thomson – Then if you have any questions about what you saw here tonight, you can contact me or Rachel and talk about it. But that is a document that you are going to be presented with on the 15<sup>th</sup>.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, that concludes our unfinished business. We can move on to new business.

Alan Thomson – Don't have any for you right now. Once we finish the shoreline, I don't have anything on deck at the moment after this.

Brian Davies – We can take a vacation.

Alan Thomson – You never know what might pop up.

**MOTION** to adjourn by Weston Kane and seconded by Brian Davies. Motion passed.

**8:10 p.m. - Adjourned**

