

**WHITMAN COUNTY  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Public Service Building Auditorium  
Public Hearing  
Shoreline Master Program  
February 15, 2023  
7:00 p.m.**

**MEMBERS:**

Chad Whetzel – Chairman  
Dave Gibney  
Weston Kane

Brian Davies – Vice-Chairman  
Russel Jamison  
Mark Tolman

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

**Others:** Rachel Granrath, SCJ Alliance; Jeremy Sikes DOE; Shelly Chambers Fox.

**7:06 p.m.** – Chad Whetzel opened the public hearing for the Shoreline Master Program update.

Alan Thomson – I’m going to turn this over to Rachel Granrath. We will go over the proposed changes that we went over last time. Since we’ve got Jeremy here from Ecology, there might be some questions that you might want to ask and we will find that out when we get going.

Rachel Granrath – Thank you, and just a reminder to everyone this is a coalition. So, we’ve done a deep dive into the Whitman County SMP, but this includes all of the other jurisdictions with shorelines in the County with the exception of Malden. So, the language is very similar in all of these and we have used WC as the example to dive into and for discussion.

I will go through this faster than we did last time. The first change in the text is on page 6 and it talks about an additional clause here of what the SMP does not apply to for activities. So, it is an exemption to properties that are exclusively under federal jurisdiction, and that is an exemption through state statutes. I know we re-worked this just a tiny bit with the language, but conversation on this might be something where you have some questions for Jeremy, too.

**19.63.105 APPLICABILITY**

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

Chad Whetzel – On #5 there needs to be a space between “no” and “change.”

Rachel Granrath – Consider it done.

Brian Davies – I am under the impression some of the language we are adding is the DOE language.

Rachel Granrath – Yes, we have followed their recommendations for suggested language. We can deviate from that, for example, we made some minor grammar changes to #6. But for the most part, those are to make it easier to comply with the State regulations.

In the definition section we have updated a couple definitions to be consistent with the Ecology check list. We added on Item D. under development, we added a # 5 which clarifies that development activity does not include:

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

That is defining and clarifying what development in the shoreline is and is not.

Dave Gibney – Also on page 12, the addition of “slaughterhouses” to what ag is.

Rachel Granrath – Jeremy just pointed that out to me. Actually, it was a typo. Sometimes it restructures that in the document. The content hadn’t changed how we spelled it.

Alan Thomson – Then on page 8, the effective date is blank right now. We don’t know when that is going to actually happen but this is what you are going to send over to the BOCC and that one has to be filled in when you know the date.

Rachel Granrath – Yes, that is a good point and that is on all of these SMPs. So, we will update that when we take it to, when we get approval from Ecology and then when we take this to the BOCC.

Then under Development at the bottom there, this is correcting grammar or the way things are spelled, “high-water mark,” with a hyphen. There are a number of places where that is going to be then changed.

Rusty Jamison – I have a question. What is the definition of shoreline as the 90.58 RCW states? When I think of a shoreline I think of a lake or ocean, but I know that is probably incorrect. Just kind of give me a definition of what Ecology is calling a shoreline right now.

Jeremy Sikes – Sure. Shorelines are defined in the law in the RCW 90.58. It is streams that downstream from a point when they reach 20 CFS (inaudible).

Rusty Jamison – Okay, I got to do a common terms. CFS, what does that mean?

Jeremy Sikes – Cubic feet per second. The way it was done in Eastern Washington was mostly based on modeling that the USGS, US Geological Survey. They modeled the watersheds and decided where this point was until this stream got big enough to be 20 cubic feet per second.

Rusty Jamison – So, it was an opinion that has become basically law. Okay, I understand.

Jeremy Sikes – Essentially, yes. In the process of these updates and during the comprehensive update, they dug in further. Where there was age data that would tell us more detail about that flow, we were able to make changes to those points. It used to be actually written in the law, to say this river (inaudible). Those have since (inaudible) been updated and WC is updated (inaudible).

Rusty Jamison – Yes, I remember that. I understand that the Palouse River and that is considered as shorelines. How small of a creek do you go into?

Jeremy Sikes – It’s pretty hard to say, there are some streams that seem very small, streams that go dry in the summertime that happen to have enough flow in them, and the average year around that they end up being shorelines of the state, under the law. Mostly if it is a stream but flows year around that you can jump across, that is probably about what you are looking at. I don’t know if that helps very much.

Rusty Jamison - Yes, it does.

Jeremy Sikes – But there are other streams that are much smaller than that and end up just flowing a ton in the spring and end up kind of (inaudible).

Alan Thomson – So Rusty, at the beginning of the document, all of the shorelines of the state in WC are shown. They are delineated. So, the Palouse River, the Snake River all are in the document. For an explanation of what a shoreline of the state is, is in the document.

Rusty Jamison – I understand. I wanted to hear it from,

Alan Thomson – Also lakes, the county (inaudible)

Jeremy Sikes – Lakes are 20 acres or larger.

Rusty Jamison – So a pond wouldn’t necessarily qualify?

Alan Thomson – A pond? No.

Jeremy Sikes – A pond if it is 20 acres or larger would qualify.

Rusty Jamison – So, I’m just saying, because there are ponds that have creeks flowing in them and the creek flows out of them.

Brian Davies – I have a hay field that becomes a 7-acre pond some years.

Rusty Jamison – I just wanted to hear from him. I know these definitions can be interpreted different ways. I wanted to hear it from Ecology. Thanks.

Rachel Granrath – Feel free to jump in with any questions. So, we will go to page 18, the top of the page. This is an updated definition to houseboat or floating homes. There are a couple locations in the SMP that we have updated. This is standard language, that is proposed by the State so we followed that language here.

Chad Whetzel – Hold on one second. So, we have a correction on page 19 at the bottom.

Alan Thomson – Yes, “stream ward.”

Rachel Granrath – Yes, that was another correction.

Chad Whetzel – Okay, now we are on page 21 at the bottom.

Rachel Granrath – Our page numbers don't line up. We are updating the language for houseboat or floating home.

***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.

This basically says there is a legal non-conforming status to anything that has existed before July 2014 and that we are as a county prohibiting houseboats to be permitted in the future on your shorelines.

On the next page, "*N*" *Non-conforming use*. So, this is clarifying language again for clarity with the regulations at the state level to talk about. We have defined a couple of different non-conforming sections including non-conforming lots, non-conforming uses, which is the use of the land, and then non-conforming structures or development. So, those are structures that are developed on a property. This language is to clarify those three different types of non-conformities and commonly referred to as grandfathering them in.

You can see on the ordinary "*high-water mark*" that there were just some grammar changes there. Alan referred to that. You will see that throughout the document.

Dave Gibney – You removed a comma on the next page.

Rachel Granrath -Yes, it looks like there was some formatting to preferred uses for "*environment or,*" that was struck out. Moving on to Riparian area, the "*high-water mark*" is hyphenated.

Moving on to the "*S*" definitions you can see we changed "*fine-grained material,*" with a hyphen.

Continuing on to the next page where you can see "*SEPA*" at the top, you can see "*high-water mark*" again for that language. Then "*Shoreline Hearings Board,*" says "*six-member,*" that didn't change the content. It is just how we fixed the grammar there.

Then down at the bottom of the page, "*Shorelines of statewide significance,*" "*high-water mark*" is another change, and then looks like we capitalized "*Cascade Range.*"

Okay, the next page, we have updated "*Substantial development.*" This number basically says that there are exceptions for permits that may fall into substantial development, if they are below a certain cost threshold. That cost threshold is updated every so often. Prices change and inflation changes so that is what that number is here, "*\$8,504*" versus "*\$6,400,*" that was in the previous SMP. I think there are two places it was updated. This is just one of those.

Chad Whetzel – Right after the dollar figure at the next sentence down, it I think it should say, "*must be adjusted,*" not "*must be dusted.*"

Alan Thomson – Good catch.

Chad Whetzel – Unless that is some new Scottish term, we are not sure of.

Rachel Granrath – I will say when we convert these documents, they are pdf so there are some weird changes that appear.

Alan Thomson – I’m not going to tell you what that Scottish interpretation is.

Rachel Granrath – Okay, you guys are on page 38.

Chad Whetzel – How come on that one we have a “1.” But not a “2.”

Dave Gibney – It is a sub-item of the one before it.

Chad Whetzel – But in order to be a sub-item you have to have more than one sub-item. We don’t have the actual page before, so,

Dave Gibney – This was adding that bit that the State Legislature added some special processing,

Chad Whetzel – I’m not so concerned with that. But the format, if you have a “1.” without a “2.” Otherwise, it is its own section.

Alan Thomson – So, what should there be, (inaudible)

Dave Gibney – You can’t say anything about it without whatever is above it on the previous page.

Chad Whetzel – I have no idea what is above it so, I’d have to see what the rest of it says.

Rachel Granrath – This is part of the administration chapter so it talks about the standards outlined in the RCW and the WACs as well as permanent review and implementation procedures. This is just clarifying here that permanent review procedures for WSDOT projects on the state highway that have that 90-day target.

Chad Whetzel- I’m not concerned with that. I’m concerned with the formatting. Usually if you have a “1.” You will have a “2.”

Rachel Granrath – We can just get rid of the “1.” and have it be part of the previous paragraph.

Dave Gibney – I see “A., B., and C.”, below there.

Chad Whetzel – But if you look at the top there is that “1.” That Indicates a subsection of whatever is before it.

Dave Gibney – Presumably whatever is before it is labeled before “A.” I disagree that there has to be a “2.” when you have a sub-item that explains something a little more. Again, without seeing everything ahead of that, I can’t speak one way or the other.

Alan Thomson – We can get the full document on the screen.

**19.63.303 ADMINISTRATION**

*A. This Master Program shall be administered according to the standards and criteria in RCW 90.58 and WAC 173-27. IN addition to the requirements of the Act, permit review, implementation, and enforcement procedures affecting private property must be conducted in a manner consistent with all relevant constitutional and other legal limitations on the regulation of private property.*

*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 time for local governments.*

Dave Gibney – I think that it is an explanatory sub-item to the previous about it and it is properly sub-item with a “1.” I don’t care enough to fight about it.

Alan Thomson – (Inaudible)

Brian Davies – It doesn’t matter to me, either.

Chad Whetzel – So, you are saying that the struck out “A.” should have been “1.”,

Dave Gibney – No, the struck out “A.” the next one that is “A.” should be “B.” and the item labeled “1.” should be labeled “1.” just,

Chad Whetzel – A sub-section of section “A.”. I’m okay with that.

Dave Gibney –Right.

Alan Thomson – Got that, Rachel?

Rachel Granrath – Yes.

Chad Whetzel – See, I had a legitimate question. I didn’t even know it but I had one.

Rusty Jamison – I have a question on the content of this, though. Given the definition of a shoreline that you gave me earlier, and what is the definition of, I see the 90-day review time, here, but what, does that pertain to like our county cleaning out roadways and things like that? Exactly what are we talking when we say “projects?” That’s the definition I need to know what that means.

Jeremy Sikes – I think that might be a question for Alan?

Alan Thomson – Where are you looking at, Rusty?

Rusty Jamison – On #1.

Chad Whetzel – I think you are confusing two things. This is for projects of the state by the state.

Rusty Jamison – And 90 days review time for local governments?

Alan Thomson – This is referring to if DOT has a road project next to a shoreline of the State, not a ditch.

Dave Gibney - And he is asking the County to review it and the County has 90 days to review it.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, is that what we are doing?

Alan Thomson – Yes.

Rusty Jamison – So then my question is, given the shoreline definition that you gave me of what is a creek and you said one to be able to jump over, then does our county government have to do the 90-day review when Mark is going out and trying to do road improvements on our county roads?

Alan Thomson – If that is next to a shoreline of the state and it goes outside the width of the road.

Dave Gibney – And it is a state highway.

Alan Thomson – Well, it could be a county road.

Rusty Jamison – It could be a county road, looks like to me.

Alan Thomson – When some of the county roads are right next to the shorelines of the state, yes.

Dave Gibney – You could piss Mark off and take six months to review his work because he is not state.

Alan Thomson – If I take six months to do that I should be fired.

Dave Gibney – I agree, but this still only applies to the DOT coming to you for a permit.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, that's what I'm trying to clarify here, because you know, I know when I asked about why things aren't getting, some of our creeks along the roads aren't being maintained, I'm kind of wondering why. This here would definitely cause some of them not to be maintained, if in fact, there is a 90-day period where they have to be reviewed and also, if the definition of shoreline is where you can't jump across the creek. Because there aren't too many ditches along our county roads that I could jump across and I'm pretty big.

Alan Thomson – So, again, you are getting things mixed up.

Rusty Jamison – Well, that's why I'm asking this question.

Alan Thomson – When you say, roadside ditches, that is different.

Rusty Jamison – Is it?

Jeremy Sikes – When I said when I was talking about a stream being shoreline, I was using the short term to kind of give you a visualization of what a stream might be for it to be a shoreline. That isn't, you should set that aside and looking at actual (inaudible) on the ground. Because we have maps that are pretty accurate, where we can have a pretty good sense of where shorelines are, and it is possible that some larger streams have been put into roadside ditches,

Rusty Jamison – Most of them are,

Jeremy Sikes – I don't think ones that are big enough to be Shorelines are. I don't think so. Because it would just be a headache.

Rusty Jamison – It is, because I have one.

Jeremy Sikes – in cases where a roadside ditch is flowing, a stream that is 20 CFS meaning (inaudible) or larger, then that is a shoreline (inaudible) and is subject to Shoreline rules that are. I don't think that has anything to do with roadside ditch maintenance in WC. They are not in the same (inaudible)

Rusty Jamison – So now,

Alan Thomson – Both the states and the counties, all states and counties, can clean their roadside ditches to protect the road bed. That is by law and that is 15 feet. They can clean those regularly, maintain those. I can't think of any shoreline of the state where that is an issue on either a state route or a county road.

But if that were the case, they would probably have to do a shoreline substantial development permit if it were a shoreline of the state. Also, it could be a regulated wetland that just goes alongside the road for a ways. That would precipitate a wetland report as well. But that is very infrequent when that happens. I can't think of any shorelines (inaudible).

Rusty Jamison – Okay.

Dave Gibney – The other thing here is that this is a maximum that Alan is supposed to act within 90 days, not, "it is going to take this long to do it."

Alan Thomson – Typically, to do a shoreline substantial development permit in my history is not going to take 90 days. A month, or a month and a half because there is a 30-day period that we have to send it out to Ecology for them to comment and approve it. So, it could be a month and a half for a shoreline substantial permit if needed.

Rusty Jamison - Okay, just so I understand then, if I have an individual like a neighbor or someone that is questioning because they know I am on this Board, they are asking why the road boss said that they couldn't clean the ditch because they didn't have the permit. Then you are the one that I can call and see if they actually even need,

Alan Thomson – Sure, give it a shot.

Rusty Jamison – That's what I'm getting at because there is quite a bit of passing the buck. That is why I'm asking these questions, here. Because a lot of times the buck gets passed to EPA and you're here clarifying that you are not really getting involved in some of these things, like as much as people think you are. So, now that you have stated the things you have stated, it helps me understand a little better what is going on here. So, I appreciate you being very candid with your definitions about,

Jeremy Sikes – As much as I can and I work for the DOE and EPA is the Federal government.

Rusty Jamison – Yes, I know. I know what you said. Summer is coming.

Rachel Granrath – Why don't we give Alan's cell phone number. Just kidding. Moving on.

### **19.63.306 SHORELINE PERMITS AND EXEMPTIONS**

Page 39. This is exemptions. So, there is some clarity here from some newer RCWs on what projects can be exempt. When we look at Fish & Wildlife Habitat passages that is really for salmonoid to reach the ocean. So, we are looking for fish passage that that's streamlined in exempt. There are exemptions for



docks, if you are replacing a dock that is below the \$22,500 cost threshold and newly constructed docks is at \$11,200 for other docks.

Moving down, there are requirements for obtaining substantial development conditional use variances, other letters from the SMA. Again, these are some other exemptions, these are remedial actions, so when we look at to fix an issue, this could be accidents, acts of God, whatnot, boatyard improvements that we are looking at water treatment facilities and addressing pollutant discharge.

We talked a little bit about the WSDOT side of things, so the DOT and some RCWs that relate there for streamlining maintenance and safety programs.

Projects that are consistent with environmental excellence, so that is another RCW that is referenced here. Then the same for energy facility site evaluation council processes.

Then there is forest practice for timber cutting that is not covered under the act and does not require a substantial development permit. I don't think you have a lot of that going on here.

Then the last one is external or internal retrofitting of an existing structure for ADA purposes. So, we can modify structures to address ADA compliance, if it has a shoreline.

Dave Gibney – I have a question for Alan, if this language had been in our plan now would you still have required a substantial development permit for that clean-up you mentioned earlier on the trail?

Alan Thomson – Along the Palouse River? Yes, as soon as you have any kind of disturbance inside the ordinary high-water mark.

Dave Gibney – Isn't that consistent with the environmental excellence program?

Alan Thomson – No. It is development.

Dave Gibney – I was just curious if that, to me the clean-up seems like something that should happen and therefore,

Alan Thomson – These kind of clean-ups the conservation districts do, are routine. I don't think it rises to the level of excellent, it is just normal stuff that they do.

Dave Gibney – Why do they need a permit at all?

Jeremy Sikes – So, the environmental excellence program is a program out of the governor's office and it is a list of projects or initiatives that is compiled year over year, and I've never seen one. I don't think we have any over here. It is one of those archaic things that are left over from earlier legislation. Frankly, so I want to make that clear.

This section 4 is in a strange place. It is along with exemptions but they are really exceptions. They are similar words but they mean different things. Under the SMA exceptions the law doesn't apply to them at all. They are invisible to shorelines. Whereas exemptions are just kind of streamlined projects that are simpler and easier to get (inaudible). In fact, sometimes you don't even need a written authorization.

So, they are similar categories but two different things. All of this blue text that you see is really tweaking and slight changes of existing exemption language that has been there for 4 years with the

exception of the ADA. That is a brand-new exemption that the legislation passed a couple of years ago. This is our way of making sure that these SMPs keep up to date with these new (inaudible).

Alan Thomson - Chad, just to address your comment about development. Yes, it is not what you think is typical development but if you look at the definition of development, "*The construction or exterior or alteration of structures; dredging, drilling, dumping, filling, removal of any sand, gravel or minerals....*" So, development under that definition. Are there any further thoughts on that section?

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

Rachel Granrath – Okay, we move on to page 43, dealing with non-conforming uses, structures and lots. If you remember from our previous conversation on the definition updates, the text here that is really clarifying and amending this section is to be compliant with those clarifying definitions in the non-conforming uses and structures and lots section of the updated language.

Then on page 52, it looks like we just had some grammatical changes here. "*Cascade Range*" was changed and "*high-water mark.*"

Page 59, "*high-quality,*" is hyphenated.

And on page 66, we have, we had a footnote that was floating so we moved that to the bottom of the page where footnotes belong. It looks like "*non-structural,*" was a change as well.

Page 107, we have some grammatical changes to "*high-quality.*"

Page 112, more "*high-water mark*" changes.

Page 117, at the top, we have "*four-year*" and that was amended in the text as well.

Page 120, "*high-water mark,*" and "*above-mentioned.*"

Page 130, it looks like "*applicants*" was amended with the apostrophe.

Page 148, last but not least, we clarify language on water residents. Again, this is part of the Ecology check list as we talked about in the definitions. There is another section that addresses floating homes, and so we have consistent language to the definitions of floating homes as well as your section relating to floating homes in the text here.

So, those sections just basically say the same thing, where anything developed before July 2014 is legal non-conforming. I don't think you have an abundance of houseboats. So, probably not as applicable here. I think that is all the changes we had.

Chad Whetzel – There was something about over-water.

Alan Thomson – That got changed. I don't know where it is right now.

Dave Gibney – It is the last one. It used to be "*new over-water*" and now it is "*new on-water.*"

Alan Thomson – Okay, thanks.

Rusty Jamison – Do we have any houseboats in WC? I guess there won't be any in the future.

Alan Thomson – I don't know of any. The Snake would only be the appropriate place.

Dave Gibney – I asked about this, last time and it was like somewhere else in the code you flat out forbid houseboats, so we are just adding it in here. Any houseboats who would have to have existed before July 2014 and they don't.

Alan Thomson – So, if you don't have any more questions on the content, we can move into the Findings of Fact, Conclusions, Recommendations. Chad?

Dave Gibney – I would move that after we put in the record and can I ask that we place the Findings of Fact as presented by staff into the record and that we adopt them as presented by staff? That was a question.

Brian Davies – He wants to know if we can admit the Findings of Fact without reading them.

Dave Gibney - And if so, I do so move.

Weston Kane – And if so, I second.

Chad Whetzel – Do we need to read the Findings of Fact, Alan?

Alan Thomson – No, you don't have to read them. We have done that in the past, too.

**MOTION** by Dave Gibney and seconded by Weston Kane to approve the Findings of Fact as prepared by staff. Motion passed.

Dave Gibney – I heard something about a delay?

Alan Thomson – The first step here is to send this to the BOCC with a recommendation. There is going to be a period of time where Ecology has to review everything and agree to it. Once that has been done, then the BOCC can act.

Rachel Granrath – I think maybe Jeremy can speak a little bit to the process because that changed from your periodic update procedure to make it easier on both Ecology and us.

Jeremy Sikes – During the last time around the local jurisdiction did the whole process first, including the BOCC adopting this and then it is sent to us and we repeat all those same steps, kind of on behalf of the State.

That has been changed now, so we are doing it at the same time that you are doing it. So, what that means is that we say we think we can approve this master plan first and then the BOCC can process it and then that's their show, instead of having to repeat the same administrative process again. That was the change to the law that came about as we were flushing out how this periodic review was going to happen. It has been working pretty good so far.

Rusty Jamison – I have a question. So, the way I understand this document we will send it to the BOCC and they will send it to Ecology, but they are going to work together, to finalize it. Is that what you are saying?

Alan Thomson – The BOCC are not going to act yet. When we pass this on to the BOCC, it is going to stop and it has to go by Ecology and Ecology has to approve everything. It is not just our shoreline update, it is the other shoreline updates as well. It is all one package.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, but what I'm understanding is, if there is a problem with this document pertaining to WC you are going to work with the BOCC to resolve that?

Alan Thomson - There could potentially be some changes. Ecology could decide they want some changes and that would have to happen at the BOCC hearing.

Rusty Jamison – But you are here representing Ecology, is there going to,

Jeremy Sikes – This is Ecology's joint hearing. So, that is what has to happen is look for feedback from the public and having their feedback at the same time.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, what I am getting at, with this planning board, I don't think we are planning on sending you any surprises. So, with both of you here, if you see anything that is wrong with this that you haven't brought up to us, is what I am getting at.

Jeremy Sikes – In fact, I even whispered, "easy peasy." So, this should be, yes, this is very straightforward. So, what happens most of the times, sometimes, is that we would have gotten public comments throughout this and so which usually terminates in this hearing.

So, there would be a period where Alan and Rachel would figure out how to address those comments and then it would come to us and we would be looking at our changes and address comments from the public. But I don't think you're getting it in this case.

Rusty Jamison – What I'm getting at here is we put a lot of work into these things. I haven't been here for all of this but I know everybody else did and it would be a shame if a dagger got put in our back. I'm hearing you say that you are not going to do that.

Jeremy Sikes – I strive to never do that. I really believe in no surprises. I've tried to stay engaged. We did have some staff turnover, but we have tried to stay engaged throughout all of these changes, so we knew what we were doing.

Really, what we are talking about is the procedure that is mandated by the law. It is really not about substance review from your house, because I have already seen all this stuff. There are no surprises. Nothing in here concerns me.

Rusty Jamison – Okay, I like to hear that. So, that's what I know our BOCC will like to hear that too. We are establishing trust.

Alan Thomson – Do I hear a recommendation?

Dave Gibney – I will move, now, therefore, be it recommended to the Whitman County Board of Commissioners that they duly amend the Whitman County Zoning Ordinance, to approve updating the Shoreline Master Program as described in the proposed ordinance thereto attached and made a part of by reference.

Be it further ordered that the Recommendation, Findings of Fact, Minutes, and proposed ordinance shall be transmitted to the Board of County Commissioners for the purpose of being accepted or rejected in

accordance with the provisions of RCW Chapter 36.70, a copy of said Amendment being attached and make part hereof. That was a motion.

Weston Kane –I'll second the motion.

Chad Whetzel – It has been moved and seconded. We will have a roll call vote.

Dave Gibney – Yes.

Rusty Jamison – Yes.

Mark Tolman – Yes.

Brian Davies – Yes.

Weston Kane – Yes.

Chad Whetzel – Yes. The motion carries.

Alan Thomson – Thank you.

Dave Gibney – I would like to say something. Being here a couple of times before, I have run into some people with the State that aren't that helpful, but Jeremy is not one of those. I think we have had a really smooth amendment to this plan and I want to thank Rachel, and the company also, so thank you.

Alan Thomson – Yes, thank you, Jeremy, I concur on that. The first go-around with Jeremy was fun. He is more fun this time because of certain things that happened during the Malden episode. It was quite interesting. Thank you all, thank you Rachel.

Chad Whetzel – We will close the public hearing.

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

**8:00 p.m. – Hearing closed**