



# Shoreline Advisory Committee Meeting #1 - SUMMARY

---

*Benton County Planning Department  
1002 Dudley Ave.  
Prosser, WA. 99350*

*October 18, 2012, 3 p.m.*

## Meeting Summary

---

### **3:10 Welcome & Introductions**

Attendance:

SAC members: Michael Crowder, Vic Parrish, Darrel Sunday, Deb Heintz, John Hobbs, Marjorie Kasper, Mark Teske, Scott Revell, Mathrew Cummings, Richard Visser, Shane Early, Tom Mackay, John Haakenson.

SAC members not in attendance: John Marvin and Mark Nielsen

Citizens: Robert & Mary Hunziker, RJ & Jeanne Blahut

County staff: Susan Walker, Michael Shuttleworth, Valerie Smith

Consultant team: Sky Miller, Lisa Grueter, Amy Summe

### **3:15 SAC Purpose & Charge**

- SAC as a Sounding Board and Steering Committee
- SAC to make recommendations to the Planning Commission. No one on the SAC has "veto rights". We are looking to get the SAC's unity and consensus on recommendations. Consensus is based on a majority opinion. We will strive to reach agreement where everyone on the SAC can work with the recommendations provided to the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.
- 16 meetings over the next couple of years - Deadline for the SMP Update is June 2014.
- It was decided by the SAC that they would meet the 2<sup>nd</sup> Thursday of the month, at 3:00 pm. The next meeting dates are November 8<sup>th</sup> and December 13<sup>th</sup>. SAC agendas and meeting materials, including summaries of the meetings will be posted on line. There will be a public comment portion on each agenda, and the public is welcome to attend.
- Community Forums will be scheduled at major milestones and will be in the evenings to attract wider public attendance. SAC members should plan to attend at least one of the two Forums scheduled per topic. First scheduled Forum topic is the Inventory and Analysis Forum scheduled for January 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup>, to be held in Prosser (PUD Auditorium), and Kennewick (PUD Auditorium) respectively.
- SAC members may e-mail questions, and meeting conflicts to [valerie.smith@co.benton.wa.us](mailto:valerie.smith@co.benton.wa.us).

### **3:30 SMP 101**

- [Power Point Presentation](#)

### **3:45 Public Participation Plan & SAC Role**

- There will be a Public Comment period scheduled at every SAC meeting. SAC should attend the Forums such as Inventory & Analysis, in January; and Visioning Forums, tentatively scheduled for Spring 2013.
- Have two-way communication with stakeholders, and be able to understand and articulate the SAC purpose.

### **4:00 Inventory & Analysis**

- [Power Point Presentation](#)
- Map Folio has been made available on the SAC webpage.
- The mapping and analysis are not site-specific.
- The Columbia and Yakima Rivers have functions and scoring that are different and separate because you can't compare apples to oranges.

### **4:20 Round Table Thoughts**

### **4:30 Adjourn**

## **SAC Questions & Answers**

---

### **SMP 101 Presentation**

1. Q: What is baseline?

A: The "baseline" establishes the existing conditions in the County's shoreline jurisdiction, and is displayed in an inventory map folio and analyzed in a Shoreline Analysis Report. The starting point from the Inventory on. SMP regulations are not retroactive, and do not seek to establish through regulations a better overall environmental condition than the current baseline. The baseline is not site-specific, but establishes an overall point of measurement from which to measure whether the SMP will achieve "No Net Loss of Ecological Functions" through SMP implementation.

2. Q: What are "Water Dependent" v "Water Related" uses?

A: Water dependent uses are those, like marinas, barge operations, etc, that would not exist if there was no water body present. Water related uses are those that may be located near the water, and access the water body, but may exist elsewhere, away from a water body.

3. Q: what are the guidelines for restoration?

A: Restoration plans are not regulatory and do not include any mandatory requirements on property owners. It will prioritize areas and improvements that would incrementally improve the overall system and describe current and future efforts by government, non-profits, and/or citizens that result in improved ecological function. There is no numeric threshold to meet when it comes to restoration.

4. Q: Will the SMP Update stop development, or be used as a Growth Management tool?

A: It will be used as a growth management tool. There will be no “blanket restrictions”. SMP is not stopping development, but in some areas it may require some development conditions, such as a larger setback to mitigate potential shoreline impacts. The SMP will allow for uses of property consistent with community goals, rather than create parcels that are unusable. The SMP is required to be consistent with the County’s Comprehensive Plan.

5. Q: Does the County intend to match the McNary Master Plan?

A: The McNary Master Plan, and other adopted plans proposed to regulate the shoreline and waterways, will be considered when updating the County’s SMP. The plans will not be identical, but wherever possible we will not aim to create regulations that contradict those intended by other plans and regulations.

## **Public Participation Plan & SAC Role**

6. Q: Are we (SAC) going to consider other agencies’ programs and views? What about the Cities’ SMP Update processes, how do they fit in with the County’s process?

A: The SAC, as mentioned above, will try to be cognizant of other agencies’ programs; one helpful avenue is that our SAC is made up of representatives who can act as the liaison to some of these agencies with regulations within the shoreline jurisdiction. Agencies and interested parties may still make comments to the SAC, and during public hearings about the SMP Update. The Cities in Benton County, with the exception of Kennewick who already updated their SMP, are undergoing their own separate SMP Update programs. The County will look to the Cities’ preferred uses when dealing with areas within a UGA or abutting the city limits.

7. Q: How will the plan be adopted? Who hears an appeal if a property owner or interested party does not agree with the final plan?

A: The County will work with Department of Ecology by sending periodic updates of our SMP update process. In part, this effort will ensure there will be no “surprises” during the adoption phase of the SMP Update process. The SAC makes recommendations to the Planning Commission throughout the process, and then Planning Commission holds public hearings and makes a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC). The BOCC also holds public hearings and then adopts a final plan that is sent off to Department of Ecology for its approval process. There may be a period of review and back and forth (6 months or so)

between the BOCC and the Department of Ecology. Any appeals or disagreements with the final adopted plan may be taken up through the Growth Management Hearings Board, who hears appeals after the updated SMP is adopted by the State (Department of Ecology).

## SAC Round Table

---

The SAC members were asked to state their personal and/or professional interest in this process and how they perceive the SMP Update process can be successful.

1. State Owned Aquatic Lands should be considered. SAC member and DNR representative distributed DNR pamphlets on regulations and DNR land ownership. DNR is rebuilding guidelines on existing and proposed uses.
2. The KID diverts water and has plans for additional diversions that will need to be recognized.
3. SAC member and private land owner made note of a lot of small buildings, roads, etc. in shoreline jurisdiction that should be allowed to rebuild. It was also noted that there are a lot of pristine areas on the Yakima River.
4. The SAC should be active and very involved with creating the SMP. Doesn't want to just have his name put on a document that sits on the shelf forever.
5. The Port of Benton is interested in the process. The port has docks, marinas, and is responsible for economic development.
6. SAC member is the operations manager (Barker Ranch) and Parks and Recreation Commission member, and Conservation District member. "No specific agenda"- he wears many hats in this arena. Interested in the process and outcome.
7. Agri NW diverts water in Plymouth near McNary, wants to continue and in the future divert more. (Note that the shorelines are not pristine, there are rocks, railroads, etc.)
8. Don't want to regulate so much to negatively affect economic activity; interested in implications of this process on agriculture, land use, and recreation.
9. 1996 flood- concerned with future loss of riverbank; in 20 years he may lose his house due to loss of riverbank; water quality needs improvement but it's good that the water is cleaner than it was 20 years ago. Interested in future uses of property. How will rafting be allowed?
10. SAC member, consultant, and former USACE employee. Love to see pristine river, but recognize lifestyle on river. Looking for the balance. Glad that there is a variety of view presented within the SAC, and that the conversation and discussion has remained on the positive. He said this is the best group he has seen formulated.
11. There are other community examples of what can happen if you're not careful (e.g. Long Beach). SAC member is a resident and Audubon Society member. She has noticed a difference in language/vocabulary amongst agencies, and jurisdictions- would like us to streamline more. Need to have a balance with small water craft. Allow water "users" for recreation, such as rafting. Wants the SAC to keep in mind that those who use the river that sometimes end up places they didn't intend (i.e. private property) by mistake. Also noted that the timing of different activities (such as sand bar removal) can have an adverse affect on wildlife.

12. SAC member and WDFW representative wants to protect natural resources. Make the Plan implementable. Looking forward to discussion of No Net Loss.
13. SAC member is a resident and representative of USFWS. His role is to think about the ecological system, as well as shorelines as a public resource to enjoy.

## Public Comment

---

Wants to see the trash picked up, and to promote controlled access or designated access to the river, whether that be on public lands or donated lands; indicated that he doesn't understand the wetlands on his own property, and how the water flows through his property into the river- wants to understand what he "can" do with his property and what uses are appropriate for his property.