

**San Juan Initiative  
Policy Group  
Meeting Summary – Approved  
Nov. 13, 2008**

**Policy Group in attendance:**

Jonathan White  
Kit Rawson  
Jody Kennedy  
Tom Cowan  
Danna Kinsey  
Amy Windrope

Lincoln Bormann  
Peter Dederich  
Patty Miller  
Sam Buck  
Jeri Ahrenius

Peter Kilpatrick  
Bob Fritzen – Dept. of  
Ecology

**Public:**

Brian Windrope  
Barbara Rosenkotter  
Susan Keys  
Carrie Cooper

**Next Meeting:** Dec. 11<sup>th</sup>, 11-3:00 at the SJ Community Theatre.

**Presentation to the County Council:** Dec. 9<sup>th</sup>, 10:45 in Council Chambers.

**Key Decisions:**

- Oct. 30, 2008 Meeting Summary approved without changes
- Approved continuing the current structure of the Policy Group and the current three-way partnership between Puget Sound Partnership, San Juan County and the Surfrider Foundation to implement the recommendations of the San Juan Initiative. Continuing this structure for the terrestrial assessment and recommendations was also approved and it was recognized that additional expertise may need to be added.
- Our recommendations will propose the same management response for both potential and documented forage fish beaches to maintain the shading function provided by the overhanging vegetation.
  - Key issue to clarify: Do forage fish have high site fidelity or do they move around amongst the various potential spawning sites?
    - What about beaches that are so wide that the vegetation is not in fact shading the spawning area?
- Based on recent information about salmon use of the nearshore and the importance of terrestrial insects to their diet, staff are directed to consider these factors when further developing requirements to maintain shoreline trees and ground cover.

- We will not address screening of homes from the water in our recommendations – this requirement has nothing to do with the ecosystem and is out of our purview.
- Consensus was not reached on whether new bulkheads be allowed only when home is threatened:
  - All yes with one block and one semi-block.
    - Issues raised in blocking: How do we address homes on both sides that have bulkheads?
    - We should be looking for technological solutions – like constant beach nourishment to maintaining beach.
    - Eventually, these homes will get a bulkhead so they should get it early enough to keep their landscaping and other uses.
    - This recommendation would take value from private property.
- We will recommend that new homes be setback to preclude a bulkhead
  - All yes, if we address the situation where homes on both sides are closer to the shore. The applicant should pay for the geo-tech expert for the county to review.
- If you are eligible for a bulkhead – meaning your home is threatened – then we will recommend the creation of alternatives in the form of grants for moving homes back or soft shore armoring or tax incentives to maintain erosion process.
- We agreed to form a sub-committee with the likely education providers to identify constraints and opportunities.
- Support current recommendations to improve compliance including the creation of a ticketing system with penalties large enough to deter unpermitted activity and an investigative monitoring program to detect unpermitted activity along beaches and bluffs.
- Approved a small subcommittee (Kit, Lincoln, Patty and Jonathan) to review the final report to be sure that it represents the concerns, issues and recommendations of the Policy Group.
- Approved the crafting of a letter from the co-chairs, using strong language to advocate for the inclusion of the SJL process and findings in the Action Agenda.
- Approved current recommendations, with the issues addressed above, be forwarded to the County Council and our other agency partners with the following additions:
  - A description of how the recommendations, if implemented, will be monitored to judge success.
  - A description of how the recommendations fit into regional protection programs at the state and federal level. In addition, a clear outline of issues that were not addressed by the Policy Group, like restoration, and why.
  - Include definitions to increase clarity around technical terms.
  - Improve description of how the rocky shoreline will be protected.
  - Recommendations to reduce the duplication between permit processes.

- Explain why we focused on protection of erosion and vegetation and that there are other important ecosystem functions and processes that will need to be addressed.