Meeting Agenda

Meeting Facilitator: Margaret Norton-Arnold

6:30 p.m. Welcome and Meeting Overview
--Margaret

6:35 What do we mean by Overarching Goals and Criteria? Results of Community Visioning
--Susan Donahue and Joanna Myers

7:00 Brainstorming: What are the themes we want to include in our goals?
--Margaret and All Members

7:40 Break

7:50 More Brainstorming and a Temperature Read: Are we hitting the mark?
--Margaret and All Members

8:15 Any additional questions on the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization?

8:30 Public Comment

8:40 p.m. Tee Up for July 1 Meeting/Next Steps/Adjourn
The power of positive thinking!

This is the theme of our fourth meeting. A number of you on June 3 said that you wanted to stay focused on the positive, and we’ll be doing that on June 17.

We’ll start out by hearing about the community visioning process that Kitsap County DCD has been conducting; this has been an opportunity for citizens throughout the County to express their goals and visions for their shoreline.

These results are meant to serve as an inspiration to the Task Force as you consider the themes and language you want to use in setting your own goals for the SMP Update process. To further inspire you, the goals you highlighted at our very first meeting have been included with this agenda. These ideas are meant to be the basis for our brainstorming session together.

Margaret will take the ideas you offer at the meeting and craft them into a set of “draft goals” for your email review prior to our July 1 meeting. At that meeting, we will finalize your goal statements. The goals for the SMP that are already prescribed by the Department of Ecology, are important to use as a checklist when evaluating the recommendations that you will develop together. But these “local goals” are also a key component of the work you will be doing.

Also at this meeting, we will do our first “temperature read” – Margaret will ask everyone, individually, to weigh in on their opinions about the themes we brainstorm together. Are we hitting the mark? Are we on track?

Also, as you have looked at the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization over these past couple of weeks, new questions may have come up, and we will allow for some time for those at the meeting.

Public Comment
Ten minutes for public comment is scheduled at 8:30.

And for July 1: We’ll get teed up for our work on Shoreline Jurisdictions.
Here’s what you said at our first meeting together:

Task Force members introduced themselves to each other by describing how they saw themselves fitting on a “spectrum” – with one end being “back to Eden on the shoreline; no new development” and the other end identified as “The shoreline is degraded already, why do we have to worry about protecting it further?”

Most members saw themselves as somewhere in the middle of this spectrum. They expressed concern for the natural resources on the County’s shorelines, and talked about making sure that all of us do what’s right for the future of this shoreline. Nearly everyone acknowledged that we can’t turn back time completely and return to an “Eden” as it were, but they also wanted to ensure that remaining resources are fully protected, and, where possible, restored. A prevalent theme was that we should protect Puget Sound and Hood Canal from future mistakes, and that the SMP should be written with an eye toward the long-term common good for both the environment and for the people who live and work in Kitsap County.

The term striving for a balance was used often as members described both their own philosophies and their goals for the SMP.

In general, members also expressed support for making sure that shoreline management is based in good science, that is, that any new policies can be backed by strong scientific rationale. A couple of the members noted that the new Shoreline Management Program must also be legally defensible.

A couple of members also expressed concern over possible new regulations that might be burdensome to shoreline property owners. One talked about the importance of constitutional and property rights. Another noted that there are already a number of regulations that are aimed at environmental protection, and expressed the concern that the SMP not conflict with, or further add to, this regulatory burden.