THURSTON COUNTY 
SHORELINES MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE 
Special Meeting with Shoreline Resident Stakeholders 
Monday, March 2, 2009 
Tumwater Timberland Library 

In Attendance 

Patrick Townsend, patrick.townsend@patownsend.com 
Cindy Pitcher 
Irene Degler 
Barb Mondau, monda@comcast.net 
Gail Sheikhizadeh, gailsheik@gmail.com 
Darlene Ruddy 
Tom Woodnutt, twoodnutt@comcast.net 
Donna Doerer, dddoerer@gmail.com 
Craig Allen, dcraigallen@hotmail.com 
Jack Marshall, jroly@comcast.net 
Denise Wakkure-Collins, dcollins@cloverpark.k12.wa.us 
Wis Macomson 
Susan Macomson, susanshag@comcast.net 
Lee Ruddy, lruddy@renehone.com 
John Vanek, vanx@comcast.net 
Mary & Preston Troy, pmtroy@earthlink.net 
Kurt & Libby Shaefe, ksheafe@comcast.net 

Meeting facilitated by John Kliem and Debbie Holden, Creative Community Solutions.
1. AGENDA

Thurston County Aquaculture Activities
Shoreline Residents Focus Group

- Shoreline Master Program Update Process (overview & discussion)
- Identifying Issues / Concerns with Shellfish Growing
- Identifying Mitigation Measures to Reduce / Eliminate impacts to Shoreline Residents

2. BRAINSTORMING SESSION

FOCUS QUESTION:

As a shoreline resident, what problems do you experience with shellfish growing activities?

RESPONSE CATEGORIES:

- Ecological Impact
- It’s a Lawless Activity
- Governmental Agencies are not Responsive to Citizens
- Quality of Life
- Favoritism to Shellfish Industry
- Unbalance: Commercial Shellfish is Monopolizing the Beach
- Quality of Life / Anxiety / Trespassing
- Lack of Science

1 Unable to address this agenda item due to time constraints; possible follow-up meeting to be scheduled
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ECOLOGICAL IMPACT</th>
<th>IT'S A LAWLESS ACTIVITY</th>
<th>GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES ARE NOT RESPONSIVE TO CITIZENS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degrading Ecology of Beach</td>
<td>Destruction of Habitat</td>
<td>Not Following SMA Priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does Biomass Change Balance of Nature?</td>
<td>Reduced Sea Life on the Beach</td>
<td>Negative Impact on Property Values $$$$$$$$$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroy Food Chain</td>
<td>Environmental Impact of Geoduck Planting &amp; Harvesting</td>
<td>Boundary Marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Quality</td>
<td>Endangered Species Threatened (Salmon, Birds)</td>
<td>Aquaculture’s Pest Management Practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of Non-Native Species</td>
<td>Death of Species</td>
<td>No Oversight or Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOLOGICAL IMPACT</td>
<td>IT'S A LAWLESS ACTIVITY</td>
<td>GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES ARE NOT RESPONSIVE TO CITIZENS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killing of Sea Birds</td>
<td>Shooting</td>
<td>No Regulations or Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference with Native Fishing Rights</td>
<td>Farmed Gallo-Mussel Escapement &amp; Hybridization with Native Mussel</td>
<td>No Governmental Coordination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altering the Natural Character of the Shoreline</td>
<td>Dumping Shells, etc., from Barges</td>
<td>Taxes &amp; Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Destruction Above &amp; Below the Water</td>
<td>Dredging</td>
<td>No County Plan for Aquaculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing Water Flow</td>
<td>Liquefaction</td>
<td>No Permitting Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impacts</td>
<td>Artificial Structures Endanger Birds and Boats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intensity – Too Much!**

- In 1 acre of Geoduck farm there are 8 miles of tubing
- No beach access due to activities
- Repetition of harvesting and replanting
- Evolved from a few oysters to overuse, crowding on beaches
- Can't get through oyster bags / rebar
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAVORITISM TO SHELLFISH INDUSTRY</th>
<th>UNBALANCE: COMMERCIAL SHELLFISH IS MONOPOLIZING THE BEACH</th>
<th>QUALITY OF LIFE / ANXIETY / TRESPASSING</th>
<th>LACK OF SCIENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VESTING</td>
<td>Safety Impact on Recreational Use</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Lack of Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrialization of the Beach</td>
<td>Lack of Public &amp; Private Access</td>
<td>Extreme Debris &amp; Pollution</td>
<td>Unnatural Farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Aquaculture’s Interpretation of “Preferred Use”</td>
<td>Commercial Farming Restricts Adjacent Residential Use</td>
<td>Litter &amp; Trespass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too Much Influence in Shoreline Policy</td>
<td>Overnight, a New Geoduck Farm Restricts Access &amp; Use to My Property</td>
<td>Encroachments on Adjacent Property</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departments are Controlled by Industry</td>
<td>Overnight Creation of a Commercial Enterprise in a Residential Area</td>
<td>Trespassing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Documentation Provided in Brainstorming Process:

1. Map of Shellfish Culture Areas in Thurston County

2. E-Mail Correspondence 2/28/09 from Laura Hendricks to P. Troy, et al.; Subject: Fwd: 02/26/09 SMP update aquaculture sub-committee meeting (concerning “preferred use” discussion)

3. Pacific Shellfish Institute Goals 2015; 3.2 GOAL – Improved regulatory stability for shellfish industry; 3.3 GOAL – Ecological impacts (positive and negative); 3.4 GOAL – Establish “In-House” capacity for the industry to evaluate water quality, currents, and general marine biological conditions in hatcheries and growing areas

4. Pacific Shellfish Institute West Coast Shellfish Research and Education 2015 Goals and Priorities: Long term goals of the shellfish industry are indicated by industry “goals and Research Priorities for 2015” clarification language 3.3.2


6. WAC 173-26-241, Shoreline Uses

7. Untitled Document addressing Social/Land Use Concerns of Commercial Aquaculture that Must be Addressed; and Public concerns with DNR leasing state aquatic lands in residential communities

8. Coalition to Protect Puget Sound Habitat (Laura L. Hendricks) paper dated January 28, 2009 entitled Regulations are Needed for Aquaculture Industry Expansion to Protect Puget Sound habitat, Salmon, and other Native Species

9. Document titled “From the Shoreline Management Act” with discussion of 1972 aquaculture vs. today’s aquaculture

10. Potential Mitigations
4. AGENDA ITEM: IDENTIFYING MITIGATION MEASURES TO REDUCE / ELIMINATE IMPACTS TO SHORELINE RESIDENTS

The facilitation was scheduled from 6:00 – 8:00 at the Timberland Library in Tumwater. Due to time constraints, participants were unable to discuss mitigation measures.

A Few Quick Final Comments

- Make aquaculture a conditional use
- Require bonds; lead to effective regulations and enforcement
- The county should sponsor another session
- The county should be the lead agency
- Pass a moratorium on future aquaculture activities until site-specific EIS prepared and completed → have a plan in place including shoreline master program
- Apply notion of critical areas are waterfront to shellfish growers

5. FOLLOW-UP AND NEXT STEPS

The facilitator will request that the County provide an additional meeting for the Shoreline residents for the sole purpose of:

Identifying Mitigation Measures to Reduce / Eliminate impacts to Shoreline Residents

If the county does not hold a second meeting, the facilitator has promised to solicit comments by email and forward them to the county.

All information collected at the March 2, 2009 meeting will be made available to the County. The County expects to use citizen comments in their development of Shoreline Master Program update.