

**Work Study Session  
Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
April 1, 2010  
Community Rooms A & B  
4:00 pm**

**PRESENT:**

Commission members: Jim Pasin, Joyce Ninen, Jill Guernsey, Michael Fisher, Bill Coughlin and Harris Atkins.

Staff Present: Pete Katich, Diane Gagnon, Jennifer Kester and Kim Van Zwalenburg from the Department of Ecology.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes from March 18<sup>th</sup> meeting:

Harris Atkins asked about some things that were agreed to at the last meeting that perhaps didn't get into the summary attached to the minutes. He first asked if the list was intended to be items they needed to complete and Senior Planner Peter Katich answered yes. Mr. Atkins thought that there was an item missing from the list, to revise paragraph 7.1 to delete the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> sentence. Also he thought that when they talked about policy d, water dependent uses, that Ms. Guernsey had suggested changing some wording and we had reached consensus to add the phrase "lawfully existing" and that should be added to the list. Also in the discussion on policy H, Ms. Guernsey had suggested changing the wording to boat launching ramps.

**MOTION:** Move to adopt the minutes of March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010 as amended.  
Atkins/Guernsey. Motion carried.

Staff response to items from March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2010

Senior Planner Peter Katich went over issues from the last meeting. During the discussion on aquaculture they wanted more info from Pierce County and Mr. Katich had talked to the planner there and he provided their regulations and e-mailed that out to the commission, affirmed that everyone received it. He also noted that he was only able to get a portion of the shoreline designation map. Mr. Katich illustrated the county map showing the designations in Henderson Bay. He pointed out a discrepancy in the UGA boundaries. Ms. Kester indicated that it was a mapping error that they don't have a resolution at this time. The county is proposing to allow aquaculture as a conditional use with the exception of floating aquaculture. He noted that aquaculture is on the holding pen list. Mr. Pasin said the area by the Purdy bridge is commercial development and yet the designation does not reflect that. Also, he expressed concern with two different designations in one area. He said he would want to change the designation to something closer to downtown. Mr. Katich said that the designations were placed because of inventory and characterizations which indicate that there are

small estuary's at McCormick and the small creek to the North, Goodnough Creek and Purdy creek. The designation is to protect those systems. In the area designated as low intensity it is residential with some commercial mixed in so the designation is a reflection of that. The urban conservancy is more appropriate for the mouth of the creeks.

Mr. Atkins asked if these designations were picked because of the County choosing theirs. Mr. Katich said that the county did implement theirs first but they were deemed appropriate by the stakeholder group. Mr. Atkins noted that in the one area where most of the commercial is both have it designated as low intensity and that just doesn't seem to be appropriate. Mr. Katich read the purpose of the low intensity designation. Mr. Coughlin asked what would we call it "city waterfront" and noted there is not much of a difference between those two designations. Mr. Katich read the purpose statement of the city waterfront designation, noting that that purpose statement doesn't really fit that area. He stated that perhaps there would need to be an entirely different designation for that area. Mr. Pasin noted the similarity to the Finholm area. Ms. Kester stated that language could be added to the low intensity purpose statement to make it fit better. Ms. Guernsey noted that if you look at the shoreline use table under commercial development and look at the differences between urban conservancy, low intensity, and city waterfront neither one of them really fit. She suggested that maybe it would make more sense to look at which category fits that area the closest with the least amount of modifications. Mr. Fisher stated that the commission was in the process of going through the matrix and then had decided to go through the policy and regulations first. He suggested that they continue going through the policies and regulations first and then address this issue.

**Consensus was reached to place the low intensity designation of the area surrounding the Purdy Bridge in the holding pen.**

Ms. Kester suggested that when we are updating the commission on issues that are going into the holding pen maybe something should just be distributed rather than spending time discussing it now.

The next issue from last meeting was about the effect of the master program on property and the environment. Mr. Katich stated that some of the data on the effect has been gathered and there is a memo dated March 31<sup>st</sup> from our consultant Adolfson. They went through our study area by environmental designation and there are about 31 acres of undeveloped or underdeveloped parcels and those are properties that we would expect to be more affected. Ms. Kester suggested that we also provide how much of that is shoreline. Mr. Pasin asked in what way would these properties be more impacted and Mr. Katich explained the method used by the consultant. Mr. Fisher said that the other side of the question is on the already developed pieces of property what percentage of actual properties are within the upland designation. He felt that it was important to understand the impact on developed pieces of property. Mr. Katich asked if he was asking for the total number of parcels within the impact area. Mr. Fisher pointed out that if it happens to be in the natural designation and the house is within the

200 feet of the shoreline there is a permitted use that is being taken away. Ms. Kester said that it is difficult to determine every nonconformity that will occur with the implementation of this document. She suggested perhaps at least just looking at use because that data is out there.

Mr. Pasin said that he didn't want the impact on existing properties to be discounted. Mr. Katich said that he didn't want to over generalize but there will be very few parcels that will be totally unaffected. Most will be impacted in some way. Mr. Pasin agreed and that was why he had a concern. Mr. Katich again emphasized that this program will have a far reaching impact. Ms. Ninen asked if the natural environment includes most of the critical areas and Mr. Katich stated that yes it did. The new requirement will be that the critical areas ordinance will be in the shoreline master program. Mr. Coughlin suggested that perhaps if they knew about the numbers of properties that are developed to over 50% it would be a good comparison. Mr. Coughlin noted that property rights are protected by the state. Mr. Katich noted that both protection of property rights and the protection of the environment are addressed in the governing principles of the guidelines in the WAC, it talks about the legal limitations of master programs. He referenced a document published by the Attorney General. He said that he felt it was good to look at the governing principles and keep them in mind.

The last thing from the previous meeting was mooring buoys. He had contacted the coast guard about establishing navigational channels and he is waiting to hear back. He believed that it actually takes an act of congress to establish one.

## Chapter 7

### Policy K - Replacement of pilings:

Mr. Katich stated that this was based on the current shoreline master program. The consultant has looked at other resource agencies and has crafted a policy. Mr. Pasin said that he had a couple of concerns. Creosote pilings are more threatening than concrete or steel, which he questioned but he was also concerned that the way that this is written if someone has an existing dock and has a piling that is deteriorated this would imply that they should replace that one piling with steel or concrete and he didn't think that was reasonable. Mr. Coughlin noted that he had seen people putting concrete over the pilings and asked if that was acceptable. Mr. Katich said that fish and wildlife and dept of natural resources will not allow creosote pilings and he directed them to page 7-18 and the regulations. He said that although we may allow the replacement of one piling for creosote you would not be able to get a permit from the state. We are trying to put our regulations more in the line with state and federal regulations so as not to set up a false expectation by issuing a permit to someone and then they run into trouble at the state and federal level. Mr. Fisher asked what the standard was for replacement and Mr. Katich went to the new and substantially expanded docks and what that would mean. He felt that it was important to define what replacement and repair meant. Mr. Atkins asked if we knew how Pierce County handled this and Mr. Katich said he expected that it was similarly. Mr. Atkins said that

he found that many jurisdictions had their current master program on line but not the draft that they are working on. He said that King County was requiring piers and docks to be constructed of non toxic materials and where toxic materials are proposed the applicant must show that no non toxic alternatives exist.

Bob Frisbie (who was in the audience) stated that there is no law prohibiting creosote pilings except in fresh water. In order to pass a law there needs to be a technical paper. I have contacted them and there is no law because there is no proof that it harms wildlife in saltwater. Ms. Ninen noted that the city may adopt laws that are more strict than the state. Ms. Ninen asked Ms. VanZwalenburg if she knew this to be true. Ms. VanZwalenburg stated that there are multiple agencies that have jurisdiction over the waters of the state and the state has spent millions of dollars pulling creosote out of Puget Sound. The guidelines say that city's should adopt master programs that require that structures be made of materials that have been approved by applicable state agencies. She noted that there are other wood treatments that are acceptable. Mr. Katich noted that in the permit process when a regulation doesn't exist SEPA is used to close that gap and often you will see comments that a mitigating measure be added to require that no creosote piling be used. Ms. Ninen said that perhaps the statement from page 77 of the guidelines should be added. Mr. Atkins said that instead of saying concrete or steel if there is a possibility of using some form of treated wood, then it should state that. Ms. Ninen felt that it should not be so specific, why not say use materials approved by state agencies. Ms. Guernsey noted that on page 7-18 and 7-19 non residential and residential, for the residential it says you must comply with Corps of Engineers. Mr. Katich said that appears to be another inconsistency. Ms. Kester said that the policy states that it should be concrete or steel and then the regulation doesn't specify which seems backwards when policy should be more general. Mr. Katich said if we reference what the state allows, when new technologies emerged we wouldn't need to change our program. Mr. Coughlin asked about historic structures or net sheds. Ms. Ninen said there is a reference to it but it doesn't say what you can do.

**Consensus was reached in generalizing K so that it referenced toxic and non toxic and to be consistent with other state requirements. Mr. Pasin said that he would like to see the ability to replace one piling with the same type as the rest of the pilings. Ms. Ninen noted the section referencing extenuating circumstances. Ms. Kester said that when we get to the regulations we could address that since this is just a policy and a should statement. Piling made of toxic materials should be replaced with piling made with materials approved by a state agency.**

Mr. Fisher said that the statement implies that if there is a single piling that the city can require the property owner to remove it and Ms. Kester pointed out the policy says should and the regulation will be more specific. Mr. Katich said that he believed that the intent was to address toxic pilings. Ms. Ninen said that perhaps there should be an a and b since it's two different thoughts. Mr. Katich said that there are a couple of pilings that are considered historic because fishing vessels have tied up to them for years. Ms. Ninen stated that there are two different thoughts; toxicity and abandoned pilings.

**Everyone agreed that it just needs more clarification that it is about toxicity and that it is really about all pilings not just replacement.**

We stopped recording at 5:30 due to technical difficulties with the recorder.

Called a recess at 5:25 and called the meeting back to order at 5:35

Mr. Fisher drafted some language.

Pilings

Existing – replace with non toxic materials including but not limited to steel, concrete and nontoxic treated wood

New – new pilings should be constructed of non toxic material approved the applicable state agencies.

Historic – if replacing historic structures should be exempt.  
If new approved materials necessary.

**Consensus was reached to incorporate this language into the policy item K.**

Item L. Moorage design elements.

Mr. Pasin said that in the second sentence it should say “above the water” when talking about the structures height. Mr. Katich said that is what we are talking about. Mr. Katich said that this is related to over water construction, there are white papers that address this issue that it causes shading in the intertidal zone which decreases productivity of organisms that salmon feed on the shading tends to divert juvenile salmon away from the water’s edge and make them susceptible to predation, so if you minimize the width of the structure or have panels for light penetration then you can minimize the impact on salmon and other fin fish.

Mr. Pasin said that the way this is written it doesn’t allow for those panels it just says you should not. Mr. Katich pointed out the first sentence. Ms. Ninen noted that on page 7-19 number 6 it says that covered moorage shall be prohibited. Ms. Ninen said why are we saying should when they are prohibited. Mr. Katich noted that in the current master program under the general regulations covered moorage is already prohibited. Mr. Pasin asked if a facility can be built that allows light penetration is it still prohibited and Mr. Katich said that yes, it’s prohibited. Mr. Fisher noted that in marinas boats sit in their berths most of the time so the shading is occurring where the boat sits anyway. Mr. Katich noted that the roof structures are much broader than the boats and that is what is trying to being accomplished is to minimize the shading. **Ms. Ninen said that the should should be changed to are. Ms. Guernsey pointed out that it should not say within the City of Gig Harbor since we are also talking about the UGA and that we are missing an apostrophe in the second line, it should say structure’s. Ms.**

**Guernsey said after the semi colon it should say using rather than use of. Consensus was reached on the language changes.**

The next section 7.4.2 policies for marinas. Mr. Katich said that the marinas are still pending a review of existing marinas that has not been completed so he asked if they would they like to review now or would they like to move on. He hoped to have the inventory by the next meeting. Mr. Fisher said that a lot of the section could be reviewed without the inventory. Mr. Katich said the purpose of the exercise was to look at the number of existing marinas and the area that is suitable for marinas to be located in. Mr. Katich noted that the upland issues are very related to the marina. Mr. Katich said that there are upland stacking of boats. Should we get into these policies now or wait until we have more information. Mr. Atkins and Mr. Pasin questioned why have a section on upland boat storage. **Consensus reached to table this issue until 4/15.**

Policies for commercial fishing moorage.

Mr. Katich said that this language is new to the master program and Mr. Pasin said that he felt that that this should be tabled as well since it deals with the same issues. Mr. Fisher said that at the last meeting it was noted that the market will dictate whether we have more marinas or more commercial fishing. **Everyone agreed to table this issue until 4/15 as well**

#### 7.4.4 Regulations – General

Mr. Fisher asked for a definition of facilities and Ms. Guernsey said that on page 2-4 there is a definition and she read the definition. Mr. Coughlin asked isn't there a ramp in Purdy over by the shopping center and Ms. Kester that if so it would be a nonconformity.

Mr. Atkins said that this regulation is a little confusing to him since it regulates boating facilities relative to the condition rather than saying that they are not allowed in any area designated as natural. Ms. Kester said that there are wetlands that are not within the natural designation. Mr. Atkins said he was just trying to take some of the subjectivity out of it. Ms. Kester explained that it could be permitted within the zone but not within critical areas. Mr. Katich said that critical salt water habitats are defined in chapter 2. Mr. Pasin said why not just say saltwater habitats, it was pointed out that it didn't include some of the other things listed here. Suggested to say critical saltwater habitats and then list the other items not included in the definitions. **Consensus was reached to modify it to read: A. critical saltwater habitats and b. marshes estuaries and other wetlands.**

#### 7.4.5 regulations – mooring buoys

Mr. Katich stated that in our meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> we discussed the policy statement and we intended to rewrite policy I for location of mooring buoys, so this would be regulations to implement this. Mr. Fisher asked when we say limited to being located on

private property where is this? Mr. Katich said that it is generally somewhere below mean low or low water. Mr. Fisher said that if someone is going to place a buoy are we setting someone up by limiting it to that. Mr. Katich said that according to the law you have to own the property where the buoy is located or lease the property from the state. The policy says private or leased. Mr. Coughlin said is there anywhere that this would exist. Mr. Fisher said that this becomes a much bigger issue on Henderson Bay. Mr. Katich said that you can see that the parcels extend quite a way out into the water.

**Mr. Katich said they would try to come back to the next meeting with some information as to where private ownership ends and lease lands begin.**

Mr. Pasin had a concern that the definition of navigational channel may be too specific to Gig Harbor and the part about ships for commerce doesn't really apply. He suggested that maybe it should just say that it is anything beyond the outer harbor line. He proposed that perhaps it should expand beyond the words Gig Harbor. Mr. Atkins said that it is further confused by the statement where it says "navigational channels where established by Washington Department of Natural Resources or the U.S. coast Guard. Mr. Katich said there should never be a mooring buoy waterward of the outer harbor line. The harbor lines are established by DNR and he didn't know that they exist everywhere such as Henderson Bay. Mr. Fisher pointed out that there are mooring buoys outside the harbor. He suggested that they end the sentence right after the outer harbor line in number 3. This could make someone propose a buoy in an area that DNR would not approve. Mr. Katich noted that harbor areas could be established and trigger this requirement. Mr. Katich suggested that he do some research on this topic and bring it back for the commission.

Ms. Guernsey asked what do we mean in 1a when we say other valuable aquatic and nearshore habitat areas. Maybe we should say critical saltwater habitat. There is no definition for it. **Consensus was reached that a) should just say avoid critical saltwater habitats.**

**Ms. Guernsey said that the last sentence in four belongs separated from the rest...maybe a number 5.**

**Everyone agreed.**

Mr. Katich went over a program Bainbridge Island is implementing for permitting mooring buoys.

7.4.6 regulations – boat launch ramps

Ms. Ninen noted that in the DOE comments there was a notation that the prohibited statement should be first. It is number 5 now and should be number one. Mr. Fisher said does this not include rails. Ms. Guernsey said boating facilities does not include rails. Mr. Katich said that we had identified the need for a definition of boat launch

ramps and Ms. Guernsey said that there needs to be a better definition for moorage facilities.

Mr. Pasin said he had a problem understanding number five (the new number one). Mr. Katich said that it is intended to limit the number of these ramps in sensitive areas. It was noted that this item is in the holding pen already.

#### 7.4.7 Piers docks and floats non-residential

Mr. Coughlin asked about mitigation and why isn't it spelled out. Mr. Katich explained it and the concept of no net loss and what may be required. Ms. Guernsey noted that we are not being consistent with terms of non residential, commercial, etc. It was noted that in the matrix it says commercial and industrial. Ms. Kester said that in the zoning code everything that isn't residential we say non residential to capture all of that. There should be a broad term but that the matrix should have the more specific uses. Is the idea that 7.4.7 supposed to cover all non residential uses.

Mr. Fisher asked about the proposed new public dock and how does it meet these requirements. Mr. Katich said that it has been designed to meet these requirements and it was pointed out that a) doesn't allow for something to be wider than 8 feet with the addition of panels allowing light to pass through. Mr. Katich illustrated how the requirement would be applied. He noted that the maritime pier has been designed to meet these guidelines. A, b and c don't seem to allow beyond the eight and needs to be rewritten. Mr. Pasin wanted the phrase reflective panels to increase light refraction to have added 'into the water". Mr. Katich will add some wording about allowing for wider than 8' in 4a and in b we need to confirm that it is 8 feet.

4 in non residential 7.4.7 should be consistent and 7.4.8 number 3. **Ms. Guernsey said that the last sentence of number four should be separated into number 5. Everyone agreed.**

Number 5 (new six)

Number 6 (new seven) Ms. Ninen stated that when something is prohibited it should be first. Make this number one. Everyone agreed.

7.4.8 number six should be one  
Make the language consistent.

Why are lifts not referenced in non residential. Add lifts to non residential. Lifts are listed under moorage facilities in the matrix. Lifts are also listed in the definition of boating facilities. **Mr. Pasin said he would like to strike 1 c since there is no standard. Ms. Guernsey asked what does it mean. Ms. Kester agreed that you already have to deal with ecological impacts. Mr. Katich said that he thought the consultant was trying to address an ambiguity in the no net loss concept. Ms. Guernsey asked Ms. VanZwalenburg if she felt it was needed. She said the city will be required to assess cumulative effects on a wider basis. Everyone agreed**



**to remove it.** Ms. Ninen said she had a note that DOE commented that there should be a statement added that preference for joint use should be included in number one. Mr. Fisher asked what that meant and how to demonstrate that, Ms. VanZwalenburg said you have to demonstrate that you can't get a joint use agreement in place. You show that you have made efforts. Ms. Guernsey said that you have to come in and show that you tried to get your neighbor to do it and they wouldn't. Staff will include a statement about preference for joint use.

**Ms. Guernsey went back to 7.4.7 and said in the old number one we use the word should and it should be changed to are allowed only when, everyone agreed.**

Decided to stop at 7.4.8

Mr. Atkins asked about the best way to provide a work product that reflects the results of our discussions for the public hearing. Mr. Katich said we have not come up with a definitive approach and he thought it was a valid concern that the public review a document with the changes made by the Planning Commission. Ms. Kester said that it will be time and resources. Mr. Atkins said that it doesn't need to be perfect it could be a marked up version.

Mr. Katich also asked due the time it's taking can we have a special meeting during the month of April so perhaps the 22<sup>nd</sup> or the 29<sup>th</sup>. Thinking that maybe the 29<sup>th</sup> works. Everyone will look at their calendars and it will be at 4pm again. Ms. Ninen said e-mail Mr. Katich or the chair when you have checked your calendar.

**MOTION:** Move to adjourn at 7:10. Atkins/Fisher, motion carried.

### **3/18/10 Meeting Outcomes:**

1. Revise matrix/associated regulations in Chapter 7 of draft SMP to allow dredging as a "permitted" use in low intensity and natural environment designations at the mouth of Gig Harbor Bay to maintain the navigational channel.
2. Per Commissioner Guernsey's request, boat launch ramp use category set forth in Modification and Use Matrix, Chapter 7, added to the "holding pen."
3. Remove "prohibited" modifications and uses from Chapter 7, subsection 7.2.1 that are not applicable to city of Gig Harbor shoreline planning area. Only address those modifications and uses that exist or could exist.
4. Revise regulation #1, Chapter 7, subsection 7.3.2 to reflect two separate regulations; note that the current, proposed prohibition on commercial shellfish aquaculture in all shoreline environments could change based on further review of the issue.
5. Revise regulation #5, Chapter 7, subsection 7.3.2 to indicate that it doesn't apply to spawned-out salmon carcasses.

6. Revise policy J, Chapter 7, subsection 7.4.1 to address “piers and docks” and revise the last sentence of the policy to state, “minimize adverse effects on “ecological functions” rather than nearshore resources.

#### **Additional 3/18/10 Meeting Outcomes-per Approval of Minutes @ 4/1/10 Meeting:**

1. Revise Section 7.1 Permitted Use Table “introductory paragraph” by deleting the second and fourth sentences.
2. Revise Subsection 7.4.1, Policy D (water-dependent uses) to state: “Locate, design, and operate boating facilities so that **new development is located in a manner compatible with other lawfully existing** water-dependent uses, such as commercial fishing operations, boatyards, and other publicly accessible over-water facilities, are not adversely impacted.”
3. Revise the “heading” for Subsection 7.4.1, Policy H, to state: “Preferred types of moorage and **boat launch ramps.**”

#### **Summary of 4/1/10 Meeting Outcomes:\*\***

1. Revise Subsection 7.4.1, Policy K (replacement of piling) to state: “**Replace existing piling with non-toxic materials, including but not limited to steel, concrete and non-toxic wood. The replacement of piling that support historic structures listed on the city’s Register of Historic Places should be exempt from this provision. New piling should be made of non-toxic material approved by applicable state agencies.**” (Note: The policy is titled “replacement of pilings.” Should the heading be revised to “New and replacement of pilings?”)
2. Revise Subsection 7.4.1, Policy L (Moorage design elements) to state: “Encourage design elements that increase light penetration to the water below an existing or new boating facility, such as increasing the structure’s height **above the water**; modifying orientation and size; **and using** grating as a surface material. No new covered moorage facilities should be allowed on or over the surface waters within the city of Gig Harbor **or its UGA.**”
3. Discussion on Subsection 7.4.2 (Policies for marinas) and 7.4.3 (Policies for commercial fishing moorage) tabled until meeting of 4/15/10 to allow for completion of marina survey.
4. Revise Subsection 7.4.4.1.a & b (Regulations-General) to state:
  - a. **Critical saltwater habitats**
  - b. **Marshes, estuaries and other wetlands**And delete original b & c (both are included in definition for critical saltwater habitats.)
5. Revise Subsection 7.4.5.1.a (Regulations-Mooring Buoys) to state:
  - a). Avoid **critical saltwater** habitat areas; and,
6. Revise Subsection 7.4.5.4 into two regulations 4 & 5 that state:
  - 4. Single-family residences may be allowed no more than one mooring buoy per residential lot and only where existing piers, docks, floats or other moorage facilities do not exist.**

**5. Mooring buoys shall be clearly marked and labeled with the owner's name, contact information and permit number(s).**

7. Revise Subsection 7.4.7 (Regulations-Piers, Docks and Floats-Non-Residential), existing regulation #1 to state: **Piers, docks** and floats associated with commercial, industrial, or public recreational developments **are allowed only** when ecological impacts are mitigated in accordance with the program, and:
8. Revise Subsection 7.4.7 to make existing regulation #1 the new #2.
9. Revise and re-order Subsection 7.4.7 by moving existing regulation #6 to #1.
10. Revise language in Subsections 7.4.7.4) & 7.4.8.3) (Regulations-Piers, Docks, and Floats Non-Residential and Residential) to be consistent with each other.
11. Separate the last sentence in existing subsection 7.4.7.4 to create a new regulation #5 that states: **To minimize adverse effects on nearshore habitats and species caused by overwater structures that reduce ambient light levels, the following shall apply: (list a-c)** and renumber existing #5 to be the new #6.
12. Revise Subsection 7.4.8 (Regulations-Piers, Docks, Floats, and Lifts-Accessory to Residential Use) by deleting existing regulation #1).c).
13. Revise Subsection 7.4.8, Regulation #6 to state: **"Covered moorages are prohibited."** Move and reorder existing regulation #6 to become regulation #1 (Note: the Planning Commission's preference is for all "prohibitions" to be listed as the first regulation under any subsection heading for regulations.

\*\* Note: additional minor "wording" revisions to existing policies and regulations that are not reflected by the meeting minutes are being tracked by staff and will be addressed by the next draft that reflects the Planning Commission's review and comment.

**Holding Pen Status:**

1. Shoreline Stabilization-Modification/Use Matrix, Chapter 7, Pg. 7-3 (3/4/10 meeting)
2. Moorage-Chapter 7 (3/18/10 meeting)
3. Private/Public Boat Launch Ramps (3/18/10 meeting)
4. Aquaculture in Henderson Bay/Burley Lagoon, Modification/Use Matrix, Chapter 7, & subsection 7.3.2, regulations 3, 4 & 5 (3/18/10 meeting)
5. Low Intensity Designation for Purdy Commercial Area-determine correct designation-(4/1/10 meeting)