

PLANNING COMMISSION  
STUDY SESSION  
Shoreline Master Program  
November 15, 2012 - 7:20 p.m.

Commissioners Present: Todd Voth, Steve Schield, Nathan Nofziger, Charles Hepburn, Todd Lengenfelder, Kevin Starcher, and Vicki Heimark

Staff Present: Anne Henning, Billie Jo Muñoz, and Sue Mahaney

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

Anne Henning, Senior Planner, reminded the Commission of the discussion about existing platted lots and how big a buffer should be required. Upon contacting the Department of Ecology it was learned that a 0' buffer is not acceptable but a 25' buffer may be appropriate depending on the lot dimensions, the current ecological functions being provided on site, surrounding land use and development patterns, etc.

Billie Jo Muñoz, Assistant Planner, provided some pictures of a bulkhead restoration project where the failing bulkhead was removed and replaced with vegetation.

Ms. Henning mentioned that the incorrect boundaries have been changed and explained the changes that were made to the maps.

There was discussion by the Commission on the designations.

There was discussion by the Commission and the following changes were made to Chapter 11, Shoreline Protection and Restoration.

## **Introduction**

### How this plan is organized

(page 5) The map portfolio that is part of the *Shoreline Inventory and Characterization* includes a map of restoration opportunities - sites at which some of the actions in this plan could be taken. Many of those sites are on public land or involve city infrastructure. For instance, several storm sewer outfalls have been identified for retrofitting to reduce pollution of the lake. Other sites are on private land. Generally, actions on private land will be voluntary. In some cases, the City may require restoration as a condition of development. Restoration actions will never be required for development of an individual single-family residence, or on land that has already been developed. ~~unless new alterations (activities) or uses are proposed within shoreline jurisdiction~~

## **Table 2 - Restoration Objectives**

### Objective

The table below shows how the six objectives of the plan relate to the management issues identified in the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization.

Table 2—Restoration Objectives

Management Issue Objective	
Alterations to hydrology	Protect hydrologic processes from further <del>alteration</del> <u>degradation</u>
	Restore altered hydrologic processes
Water quality and sediment	Protect water quality, native plant communities, and fish and wildlife habitat
	Restore water quality, native plant communities and fish and wildlife habitat
Riparian and wetland habitat	Protect riparian and shallow water habitat and migration corridors
	Restore riparian and shallow water habitat and migration corridors

Strategies, actions, and potential restoration sites related to each objective are tabulated in the Restoration Opportunities section that follows.

**Restoration Opportunities**

The table below lists the City’s six restoration objectives and outlines strategies and actions for each one. It also states where each action may be applied, including target reaches, where those have been identified in the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization. As noted in the paragraph on Adaptive Management above, the list of strategies and actions can be expected to evolve as projects are completed and their results evaluated, and as new opportunities arise. See Restoration Potential map in Shoreline Inventory and Characterization map portfolio

Objective	Strategy	Action	Target reaches*
(p. 7) Protect hydrologic processes from further <del>alteration</del> <u>degradation</u>	Coordinate lake management with other jurisdictions agencies and irrigation districts including the Moses Lake Irrigation and Rehabilitation District	Initial steps will depend on the City’s existing relationships; see “Regional Coordination” under the heading “Restoration Resources” below	Ecosystem-wide
(p. 10) Protect water quality ( <i>continued</i> )	Maintain the natural value of wetlands to control and filter storm water runoff	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•SMP regulations will provide protection in shoreline areas within the City</li> <li>•<del>Amend CAO to increase wetland buffer widths outside of shoreline areas and to ensure adequate protection of wetlands and their buffers</del></li> <li>•Strictly enforce the City’s CAO and SMP</li> <li>•Educate landowners and developers about wetland functions, values, and protection</li> <li>•Work with Grant County officials to protect wetlands and their buffers in the City’s UGA</li> </ul>	City-wide (some steps may also be taken within the UGA, if the City chooses)

On page 14, the Commissioners questioned the feasibility of moving parking areas out of SMP jurisdiction at public parks such as Montlake. The Commission requested that staff identify some additional alternatives that would achieve the goal of "reduce/prevent runoff from parking areas."

### **Existing and Ongoing Programs**

#### **Restoration Resources**

#### **Tax Relief/Fee System**

The City may want to consider a tax/fee system to directly fund shoreline restoration measures. Possibilities include:

- Working with Grant County to craft a preferential tax incentive through the Public Benefit Rating System administered by the County under the Open Space Taxation Act (RCW 84.34), to encourage private landowners to preserve natural shore-zone features for "open space" tax relief. The Department of Ecology has published a technical guidance document for local governments that wish to improve landowner stewardship of natural resources. More information about the program can be found at <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/biblio/99108.html>. The guidance document provides "technically based property selection criteria designed to augment existing open space efforts with protection of key natural resource features which directly benefit the watershed. Communities can choose to use any portion, or all, of these criteria when tailoring a Public Benefit Rating System to address the specific watershed issues they are facing."
- Establishing a Shoreline Restoration Fund. A chief limitation to implementing restoration is local funding, which is often required as a match for state and federal grant sources. To foster ecological restoration of the City's shorelines, the City could establish an account that may serve as a source of local match monies for non-profit organizations implementing restoration of the City's shorelines. The fund could be administered by the Shorelines Administrator and supported by a levy on new shoreline development proportional to the size or cost of the new development project. Monies drawn from the fund would be used as a local match for restoration grant funds.

There was some discussion and staff was directed to rework this section to distinguish between the tax relief and fee systems.

#### **Benchmarks and timelines (p.23)**

The Commission directed staff to adjust the timelines, since some of the dates in the current draft are already past.

<p>2015</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The City has highlighted locations for most efficient and effective stormwater retrofitting</li> <li>•The City enjoys good working relationships with other local governments and with resource agencies, and works in partnership with them to protect and restore shoreline ecological functions at the ecosystem level</li> <li>• The City has provided public access at the railroad grade in Neppel Park and restored the emergent vegetation and vegetative buffer</li> <li>•On at least one City-owned site, the City has developed vegetative buffers around parking areas and directed overland flow away from the lake</li> <li>•The City has updated its development regulations to manage runoff from upland areas and to protect vulnerable soils outside of shoreline areas</li> <li>• An incentive program to encourage protection of wetlands on agricultural land is in place and available to landowners throughout the subbasin, and the City and its partners are actively promoting participation</li> <li>• An incentive program to encourage protection of vegetative buffers on agricultural land is in place and available to landowners throughout the subbasin, and the City and its partners are actively promoting participation</li> <li>• The City enjoys good working relationships with recreation user groups, and works in partnership with them to protect and restore shoreline ecological functions at the ecosystem level</li> <li>• At least 75% of construction sites in the City use proper erosion controls, <del>and use them correctly</del></li> <li>• The City has completed a bulkhead replacement demonstration project (moved from 2020)</li> <li>• A program for restoration of vegetative cover and riparian buffers in areas prone to high soil erosion is underway, with funding and a project sponsor (moved from 2020)</li> <li>• A comprehensive outreach and education program ensures that at least 75% of landowners, local lake users, developers, real estate agents, and managers of agricultural lands understand the effects of their decisions on water quality and on riparian habitat and migration corridors; the reasons for development regulations that protect shoreline ecological functions; and, where applicable, the incentive programs available to them (moved from 2030)</li> <li>• The City actively promotes shoreline incentive programs, including developing and distributing educational material, communicating with landowners, and working to develop funding (possibly in partnerships with other project sponsors)</li> </ul>
-------------	---

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