Welcome/Meeting Overview
Margaret welcomed everyone to the first Task Force meeting in 2011. During this meeting, members worked in small groups to assign environment designations to various areas in Kitsap County. This was an educational exercise to help the Task Force better understand the key elements and decision factors in the environment designation process.

Task Force Housekeeping
David reported briefly on the Planning Commission’s review of the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization, and thanked the Task Force members who had attended the public hearing in December. The Planning Commission has raised some good questions; DCD staff are in the process of responding to those.

Environment Designation Discussion
The Task Force divided into three working groups, which were assisted by Patty Charnas, Kathlene Barnhart, and Dave Greetham. The groups were provided with information from the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization and the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). Working together, the groups determined the most appropriate environment designations for various Nearshore Assessment Units (NAUs).

After the work had been completed, each group reported on the results of the exercise. Margaret reiterated that the process of going through the exercise was just as important as the final product.
Seabeck Area
The group divided this NAU into two different designations: Natural and Rural Conservancy.

The area is currently designated for rural protection. The nearshore includes eelgrass and overhanging vegetation, and provides habitat for herring spawning. Bald eagles nest here. There are some geological hazard areas and it is also a water recharge area.

Part of the group’s discussion focused on the possibility of dividing the NAU into parcels, with differing designations applied on a parcel-by-parcel basis. These designations would be determined based on any existing development, as well as property ownership. Public parcels, for example, might be designated differently than those under private ownership.

The comment was made that this level of flexibility is allowed for under the Ecology guidelines: *The guidelines say you can be flexible by allowing for sub-areas within the environment designation. As long as you are meeting the general objective, you can apply different designations in sub-areas.*

Others in the group, however, felt that a parcel-by-parcel approach would not appropriately recognize ecosystem-wide features.

Hansville Area
This group determined that their NAUs should have a Rural Conservancy designation. Because there are some public lands and park lands in one of the areas, these should be also be labeled as conservancy areas, with the possibility of creating a Park Conservancy sub-designation.

Other than homes along a large stretch of one NAU, this is a largely undeveloped area below ordinary high water of the shoreline, and robust fishing takes place here. The nearshore habitats are conducive to fish spawning and juvenile rearing.

The group reported that they were able to achieve good consensus on this designation. There was some debate about the application of Rural Conservancy or Shoreline Residential, but based on the current WAC guidelines, Rural Conservancy was the best fit. There was some discussion about the need for either a new Rural Residential designation or altering the WAC designations to cover those residential uses in rural areas.

Southworth Area
There used to be brick manufacturing plant in this area. It is currently home to a salt marsh, and is also an area of high residential use. Both Rural Conservancy and Natural designations could be possible in this area. The group debated both of these, but ended up agreeing on the Rural Conservancy designation.

The group applied their local knowledge to the information presented from the *Inventory and Characterization*. For example, geoduck and Dungeness crab were highlighted in the description, but the area is a salt marsh and the sand is pebbly, so there are probably not a lot of crab here. In addition, small invertebrates and fish are more likely to be present rather than geoduck.
Members of this group urged that the list of environment designations not be expanded unless there is a real need to do so. The permitting process shouldn’t be overcomplicated by too many designations. The suggestion was made that some of the existing designations could be “tweaked” to serve as a better description of a particular area.

One example of this is the “Shoreline Residential” designation. A member commented: It seems that the existing designations didn’t necessarily fit well with Kitsap County; as noted we have lots of areas that are already developed with houses, but they are outside city limits. We should expand this to acknowledge that Shoreline Residential could be outside of the UGA.

In response, another member expressed concern: How can we ensure conservation if we don’t designate those areas for protection?

Response: The designation would only be revised in areas where there is existing residential development; this area already has homes on it, so it’s not a natural area we can protect. Areas without homes would still be Rural Conservancy. But we have to be realistic about what exists.

And back: It’s very important to put the conservation elements in – preserve and protect those areas. That’s what the people in Kitsap County want.

After the discussion, Patty noted that the exercise was realistic: This is what DCD staff are currently wrestling with. It’s a matter of balancing ecosystem functions with existing and planned uses, and it can be really difficult to determine if and how the designations fit.

Public Comment

Three members of the public offered their comments:

- It looks like you are very focused on the shoreline, but there is not much data specifically related to the water. I’m concerned about the measurements that Battelle made, and I’m concerned about the County’s data on property ownership.

- We have to ask ourselves what we are trying to do and how we are trying to do it. What are the functions and values we are trying to protect? Is the objective to depopulate the shoreline? Can property owners build on their own properties? Will the County’s planners have the data necessary to determine if a new house or an existing bulkhead will negatively impact the shoreline? Shoreline property owners pay a significant amount of property tax to Kitsap County. The Department of Ecology needs to demonstrate a “proof of harm” from shoreline development. I don’t see that they have that proof.

- It looks like you are going to have this same exercise for every single meeting from now to June. When you do start doing the rule making? Also, everything seems to be focused on saltwater; I don’t see any work being done for rivers, lakes, and streams.
**Tee Up for February 3**

Margaret and DCD staff explained the schedule for upcoming meetings. In general, the meetings will be based on products that have been generated by DCD. The Task Force will review, comment on, and make recommendations on these products. Each meeting will address one or two environment designations: where those designations will be assigned, as well as the preferred uses and shoreline modifications that will be allowed within each of the designations.

The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for February 3, 6:30 p.m. at the Silverdale Beach Hotel. Staff will present a preliminary draft map of all of the environment designations in Kitsap County. Again, this will be a draft, but it’s a place to start the discussion. After February 3, each designation will be reviewed and discussed in more detail with the Task Force.

Bob Benze reiterated that at the June 17, 2010 meeting he had asked for a presentation on the methodology DCD had used to go from the Battelle data to the *Inventory and Characterization*. He offered to give the presentation himself if it would be useful, noting that most Task Force members probably don’t understand how this was achieved.

Patty encouraged Task Force members to read the WAC sections related to environment designations, suggesting that this would be a good way for members to refresh their memories in advance of the meeting discussions.