I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Requested Action: An application submitted by Grant County PUD for a shoreline substantial development permit, a shoreline conditional use permit, a shoreline variance and a conditional use permit for upgrading the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch site. Site improvements include: constructing an improved boat ramp, improving the access and maneuver area, installing 10 parking spaces, constructing an ADA transfer platform and single vault toilet, installing ADA access, stormwater improvements, signage and trash receptacles.

Location: The subject property is described as being located within the SW Quarter of Section 9, Township 20N., Range 22 E., W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The shoreline designation is Natural. The Douglas County Assessor's Parcel Number is 20220920003

Background: This site is an existing primitive county road that accesses the shoreline. The road bed was flooded in 1959 when the construction of Wanapum Dam raised the river level. Since this time the site, where the road enters the water, has been used as an informal boat launch. No county permits have been issued for this facility.

II. SITE INFORMATION

Site Characteristics: The subject property includes a primitive curved, single-lane launch composed of rock and cobbles. The site also has an informal parallel parking area that consists of unvegetated native surface soils, located on the downslope edge of Spanish Castle Road. The site is surrounded by intake and semi-intact shrub-steppe habitat, wetland and riparian habitat adjacent to the Columbia river. A more detailed description of site conditions can be found in Section 3.1 of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management and Mitigation Plan.

Zoning and Development Standards: The subject property is zoned as Rural Resource 20 acres. The purpose of the RR-20 rural resource district is to encourage and maintain the county's rural character; provide opportunities for compatible agriculture, grazing, forestry and other rural land uses that are sensitive to the area's physical characteristics; and provide greater opportunities for protecting sensitive critical/environmental areas.
III. COMPREHENSIVE PLAN:
The following goals and policies set forth in the Douglas County Countywide
Comprehensive Plan are relevant to this development:

CRITICAL AREAS – WETLANDS

GOAL 1: Douglas County’s wetlands will be protected to the greatest extent reasonable
because they provide important functions that help define the quality of life in Douglas
County.

POLICY CA-1: Protection of and preservation of wetlands shall be preferred to
alteration and mitigation of impacts to wetlands.
POLICY CA-2: Wetlands will be rated consistent with the Washington State Department
of Ecology’s (Ecology) Wetlands Rating System for Eastern Washington (Publication
Nos. 91-058 and 02-06-019, as amended).
POLICY CA-3: Wetlands will be identified according to the methodology described in
the Washington State Wetlands Identification and Delineation Manual, 1997, publication
#96-94, as amended.
POLICY CA-5: Wetlands will be protected as much as reasonable from alterations due
to land use changes that may create adverse impacts to the wetland.
POLICY CA-9: Development proposals that encompass wetland areas will have a site-
specific review process required to determine the classification.
POLICY CA-10: Projects containing a wetland should submit a comprehensive wetland
mitigation plan that includes sufficient monitoring and contingencies to ensure natural
wetland persistence.

CRITICAL AREAS – FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION AREAS

GOAL 2: Protect fish and wildlife habitat areas as an important natural resource for
Douglas County, particularly in regard to their economic, aesthetic and quality of life
values.

POLICY CA-14: Impacts of new development on the quality of land, wildlife and vegetative
resources will be considered as part of the environmental review process and require any
appropriate mitigating measures. Such mitigation may involve the retention and/or
enhancement of habitats.
POLICY CA-15: The maximum amount of vegetation should be maintained in its natural
state and be disturbed only as minimally necessary for the development. Disturbed areas
should be re-vegetated with native vegetation as soon as possible. Re-vegetation will be
maintained in good growing conditions, as well as being kept free of noxious weeds.
POLICY CA-16: If a development proposal is located in or near a habitat conservation area
shown on the reference maps, a consultation and subsequent mitigation measures, if
needed, should be encouraged from the WDFW or other appropriate agency.
POLICY CA-19: Proper riparian management that maintains existing riparian habitat and is
consistent with best agricultural management practices should be encouraged.
POLICY CA-20: Ensure that land uses adjacent to naturally occurring wetlands and other
fish and wildlife habitat areas will not negatively impact the habitat areas. If a change in
land use occurs, adequate buffers will be provided to the habitat areas.
POLICY CA-21: Activities allowed in fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas and open
space will be consistent with the species located there, including all applicable state and
federal regulations and/or best management practices for the activity regarding that species.

IV. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM

The Douglas County Shoreline Master Program classifies this reach of the Columbia River shoreline as Natural. The natural shoreline environment designation is intended to protect or restore shoreline areas that are relatively free of human influence or that include intact or minimally degraded shoreline functions that are intolerant of human use. These systems require that only very low intensity uses be allowed in order to maintain the ecological functions and ecosystem-wide processes. Future uses should be compatible with the natural characteristics that make these areas unique and valuable.

A listing of the applicable policies and regulations are found in the analysis section of this staff report.

WASHINGTON ADMINISTRATIVE CODE (WAC)
WAC 173-27 provides updated rules for administering the Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58) and the local master program. WAC 173-27-150, establishes minimum review criteria for substantial development permits. WAC 173-27-160 establishes minimum review criteria for conditional use permits. WAC 173-27-170 establishes minimum review criteria for variances. A review of this criteria can be found in the Project Analysis section of the staff report.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

Grant County PUD is SEPA Lead Agency for this project and has issued a Determination of Nonsignificance in accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2).

VI. AGENCY AND PUBLIC COMMENTS:
Applicable agencies have been given the opportunity to review this proposal. The following agencies have been sent copies of the proposal and have commented as indicated below:
The above agencies have provided comments. These comments are included in Appendix A.

No public comments were received at the writing of this staff report.

VII. PROJECT ANALYSIS

Upon review of the application materials, site plans, public and agency comments, the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, and applicable codes and requirements, planning staff offers the following analysis and recommendations for the subject application:

**Comprehensive plan consistency:**
Recreational and public access opportunities in shoreline areas can be considered when potential adverse impacts to water quality, slope stability, vegetation, wildlife and aquatic life have been sufficiently addressed. Critical area policies place preference on the protection of and preservation of wetlands over the alteration and mitigation of impacts to wetlands. The proposal is consistent with the goals and policies of the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan.

**Consistency with the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program**

The shoreline environment designation for the subject property is Natural. An Aquatic Habitat Buffer Assessment dated December 30, 2013 from Anchor QEA was performed for the subject property. The assessment determines that the zone 1 and zone 2 buffers are applicable resulting in a 200 foot buffer from OHWM.

**NOTE:** The applicant has provided an analysis of how the application meets the applicable goals, policies and regulations from the SMP.
Natural Environment Policies

POLICY 2: Preservation of the area's ecological functions, natural features and overall character must receive priority over other potential uses.

The project will help preserve the area's ecological functions. Currently the existing boat launch is just the end of a road entering the water. Erosion and riverbed damage occurs due to tow vehicles and boats utilizing the facility. This proposal will construct a formal launch ramp which will eliminate that impact. Parking for the facility is informal with some parallel parking in the graveled access and other parking occurs in the native vegetation adjacent to the launch. This proposal will establish designated parking spaces and physically restrict parking outside of the designated areas which will reduce damage to the surrounding vegetation. Application materials propose to fully mitigate impacts per the adopted mitigation ratios.

POLICY 7: Private and/or public enjoyment of natural shoreline areas should be encouraged and facilitated through low intensity recreation use, scientific, historical, cultural, and educational research uses, provided that no significant ecological impact on the area will result from the proposed development.

The proposal is for a low intensity boat launch facility. The management and mitigation plan states that there will be no significant ecological impact. Application materials propose to fully mitigate impacts per the adopted mitigation ratios.

Public launch ramps, parking accessory to a permitted use, and water dependent recreational uses are shoreline conditional use permits in the Natural shoreline environment.

4.1 ECOLOGICAL PROTECTION AND CRITICAL AREAS

POLICY 1: Shoreline use and development should occur in a manner that assures no net loss of existing ecological functions and processes and protects critical areas. Uses should be designed and conducted to avoid, minimize, or to fully mitigate in so far as practical, any damage to the ecology and environment.

The project cannot avoid impact to the aquatic environment. Additionally, the Aquatic Habitat Buffer encompasses the entire PUD ownership in this area therefore impact to the buffer cannot be avoided. However, the project has been designed to minimize damage and to fully mitigate pursuant to adopted mitigation ratios.
REGULATION 1: Mitigation sequencing – applicants shall demonstrate all reasonable efforts have been taken to mitigate potential adverse impacts in the following prioritized order:

a. Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action;

The project cannot avoid impact to the aquatic environment. Additionally, the Aquatic Habitat Buffer encompasses the entire PUD ownership in this area therefore impact to the buffer cannot be avoided.

b. Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation, by using appropriate technology, or by taking affirmative steps, such as project redesign, relocation, or timing, to avoid or reduce impacts;

The applicant performed an Alternatives Analysis dated July 15, 2013 which is included in the application materials. The size of the facility has been limited while in keeping with FERC requirements. The facility location minimizes impacts to habitat and buffers while taking into account archaeological impacts.

c. Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment to the conditions existing at the time of the initiation of the project;

The project is for a new structure to be placed in the aquatic environment and expanded development into buffer areas, therefore rectifying the impact is not possible.

d. Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action;

The project is for a new structure to be placed in the aquatic environment, therefore reducing or eliminating the impact over time via this permit is not possible.

e. Compensating for the impact by replacing, enhancing, or providing substitute resources or environments; and

The project is proposing mitigation per the adopted mitigation ratios that will compensate for the impact. Suggested conditions of approval require installation of approved mitigation.

f. Monitoring the impact and the compensation projects and taking appropriate corrective measures.

Suggested conditions of approval require that the mitigation measures be monitored for 5 years after installation to determine survivability and corrective measures be taken if survivability is not achieved.
4.2 WATER QUALITY

REGULATION 2: New development shall provide stormwater management facilities designed, constructed, and maintained in accordance with the current stormwater management standards. Deviations from these standards may be approved where it can be demonstrated that offsite facilities would provide better treatment, or where common retention, detention and/or water quality facilities meeting such standards have been approved as part of a comprehensive stormwater management plan.

The applicant has provided a stormwater analysis developed by an engineer licensed in the State of Washington. This analysis indicates that design for the facility demonstrates compliance with Douglas County Code and the Eastern Washington Stormwater Management Manual. Suggested conditions of approval require implementation of the stormwater plan during site development.

REGULATION 3: Best management practices (BMP’s) for control of erosion and sedimentation shall be implemented for all development in shorelines through an approved temporary erosion and sediment control plan, identified in the Stormwater Management Manual for Eastern Washington, as amended.

The application materials include an erosion control plan (Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan – SWPPP) is included on plan sheets 6 and 7 attached to the JARPA.

REGULATION 7: Permanent stormwater management systems serving property within the shoreline shall be designed using best management practices ensuring water quality treatment in compliance with the Stormwater Management Manual for Eastern Washington to prevent stormwater runoff from degrading or adding to the pollution of recipient waters or adjacent properties. Maintenance of storm drainage facilities on private property shall be the responsibility of the property owner(s). This responsibility and the provision for maintenance shall be clearly stated on any recorded subdivision, short plat, or binding site plans map, building permit, property conveyance documents, maintenance agreements and/or improvement plans.

The applicant has provided a stormwater analysis developed by an engineer licensed in the State of Washington. This analysis indicates that design for the facility demonstrates compliance with Douglas County Code and the Eastern Washington Stormwater Management Manual. Suggested conditions of approval require implementation of the stormwater plan during site development and maintenance covenants for the stormwater system structures be recorded and implemented upon completion of construction.
4.3 VEGETATION CONSERVATION

**REGULATION 2:** Where impacts to buffers are permitted under Section 4.1, Ecological Protection and Critical Areas, new developments shall be required to develop and implement a management and mitigation plan. When required, management and mitigation plans shall be prepared by a qualified biologist and shall be consistent with the requirements of Appendix H. Management and mitigation plans shall describe actions that will ensure no net loss of ecological functions. Vegetation shall be maintained over the life of the use and/or development by means of a conservation easement or similar legal instrument recorded with the County Auditor.

A wetland and fish and wildlife management and mitigation plan prepared by Anchor QEA was submitted in the application materials.

**REGULATION 4:** Native vegetation clearing shall be limited to the minimum necessary to accommodate approved shoreline development.

The Alternatives Analysis Document and Section 5.2 of the habitat management and mitigation plan provides documentation that native vegetation clearing has been limited to the minimum necessary. Design of the launch ramp is for a single primitive facility that utilizes the existing footprint as much as possible. The parking/loading area has been minimized as much as possible consistent with FERC requirements and utilizes the existing grades. Additionally, the proposed facility is located to utilize as much of the existing disturbed area as possible.

4.4 Archaeological and historical resources

**REGULATION 1:** If archaeological resources are uncovered during excavation, developers and property owners shall immediately stop work and notify the local government, the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and affected Indian tribes.

*Suggested conditions of approval require that agencies be notified and to halt work if resources are uncovered until proper authorities/agencies are notified.*

**REGULATION 2:** An archaeological resource site inspection and/or evaluation is required by a professional archaeologist in coordination with affected Indian tribes where known archaeological resources are present. Properties near a site known to contain a historic, cultural or archaeological resource(s) shall require a cultural resource site assessment.

*Multiple archaeological resource site evaluations have been performed on this site and in the immediate and surrounding areas. At least one registered archaeological site is located on and around the proposed facility.*
REGULATION 3: If a cultural resource site assessment identifies the presence of significant historic or archaeological resources, a cultural resource management plan shall be prepared by a professional archaeologist or historic preservation professional. In addition, a permit or other requirements administered by the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation pursuant to RCW 27.44 and RCW 27.53 may apply.

The applicant has provided communication from May 13, 2013, September 9, 2013 and October 30, 2013 from the District’s Senior Archaeologist to the WA Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. This communication documents that the project will have an adverse effect on a registered archaeological site and commencement of a memorandum of agreement for resolution of the adverse effect. The WA Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation as well as the Tribes have been consulted on the design and impacts of the facility.

4.6 Public access

REGULATION 4: Boating facilities, including marinas and public/community launch ramps, shall provide public access, consistent with the provisions of this Master Program.

The site is currently an informal boat launch facility with limited accessibility. This application is to construct limited upgrades to the site to increase accessibility. These improvements are; improve the launch ramp to improve boat access to the water during varied water levels, increase and define the parking area, construct an ADA transfer structure, install restroom and trash receptacles. These improvements will improve public access to this reach of the river and are designed in size and scope consistent with the provisions of the SMP.

REGULATION 12: Access improvements shall not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions and values.

The applicant has submitted a Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management and Mitigation Plan in which the biologist of record details that the project will not create a net loss of shoreline ecological functions and values.

5.3 Boating facilities: marinas and launch ramps

REGULATION 2: Connecting roads between boating facilities and public streets shall have all weather surfacing, and be compliant with local jurisdictions’ fire safety and road standards in terms of width, safety, alignment, sight distance, grade and intersection controls.

Transportation services and the county fire marshal have commented primitive nature of the road accessing the launch facility. After a meeting between the Board of County Commissioners and Grant County PUD, transportation services has provided comment requiring a temporary and permanent signage plan identifying the primitive nature of the road (see transportation comments – March 4, 2014). An engineered signage plan dated received May 1, 2015 was submitted by the applicant. The fire marshal identified that the access road must be improved with two wide spots to facilitate vehicles passing each other along the access (see fire marshal comments – October 28, 2014).
REGULATION 29: Launch ramps shall not be permitted within the following shoreline habitats because of their scarcity, biological productivity and sensitivity unless no alternative locations is feasible, the project would result in a net enhancement of shoreline ecological functions, and the proposal is otherwise consistent with this Program:

- Wetlands with emergent vegetation (marsh type areas);
- Spawning and holding areas for anadromous fish;
- Alkaline lakes

The biologist of record has indicated that there are no wetlands with emergency vegetation present in the project area nor any spawning and holding areas for anadromous fish. The project is located on the Columbia River, therefore an alkaline lake cannot be present in the project area.

REGULATION 31: Launch ramp facilities shall provide public access for as many water-dependent recreational uses and users as possible, commensurate with the scale of the proposal.

As noted in 6b of the JARPA this proposal is to minimally improve an informal boat launch. This location is one of a few launches on the eastern side of the Wanapum Reservoir and is the northernmost facility. Improving the launch ramp will facilitate increased access to the river during varied river conditions while reducing shoreline impacts. Construction of parking will allow additional boaters to use the facility while reducing impact to adjacent vegetation. Construction of the ADA transfer structure will disabled boaters to utilize the facility.

REGULATION 32: Launch ramp facilities shall be designed so that lawfully existing or planned public shoreline access is not unnecessarily blocked, obstructed nor made dangerous.

The nature of the shoreline and vegetation that currently exists in this location limits shoreline use to a launch ramp in the location of the existing road bed.

REGULATION 34: Launch ramps shall be located where water depths are adequate to avoid the need for dredging and/or to minimize potential loss of shoreline ecological functions or processes.

The applicant has not identified the need for maintenance dredging. The existing boat launch has been in operation for 20+ years, maintenance dredging has not been necessary.

REGULATION 35: Launch ramps shall be located and designed with minimum necessary shoreline stabilization to adequately protect facilities, users, and watercraft from floods or destructive storms.

The new ramp is proposed to be placed largely in the same footprint as the existing old roadbed. The applicant's analysis and design has not identified the need for additional stabilization beyond the immediate construction.
REGULATION 37: Garbage or litter receptacles shall be provided and maintained by the operator at several locations convenient to users.

The applicant has proposed garbage receptacles. The operator will maintain the receptacles concurrent with maintenance of the proposed restroom facility.

REGULATION 39: At public or community launch ramps, trailer spaces at least 10 feet by 40 feet shall be provided commensurate with projected demand.

The applicant is proposing 8 – 10’x45’ tow vehicle spaces plus 2 10’x20’ passenger vehicle spaces.

REGULATION 40: Preferred launch ramp designs, in order of priority, are:
   a. Open grid designs with minimum coverage of substrate.
   b. Seasonal ramps that can be removed and stored upland.
   c. Structures with segmented pads and flexible connections that leave space for natural substrate and can adapt to changes in substrate profile.

The applicant is proposing a ramp design with segmented pads and flexible connections.

REGULATION 42: Accessory uses at launch ramps shall be limited to those water-oriented uses, or uses that provide physical or visual shoreline access for substantial numbers of the general public. Accessory development includes, but is not limited to, parking, open air storage, waste storage and treatment, stormwater management facilities, utilities, and land transport development.

The only uses proposed at the site other than the launch ramp are accessory parking and restroom facility.

REGULATION 44: Applicants for public boat launches shall provide habitat surveys, critical area studies and mitigation plans as required by Section 4.1 Ecological Protection and Critical Areas. A slope bathymetry map may be required when deemed beneficial by the Administrator for the review of the project proposal.

Critical areas studies for the project include: wetland delineation and rating; aquatic habitat buffer assessment; and geologic hazards assessment. A wetland and fish and wildlife habitat management and mitigation plan identifies the impacts of the project and details the mitigation plan. A more detailed analysis of the impacts and proposed mitigation can be found later in this staff report in the Appendix H Critical Areas section.

REGULATION 45: Applicants shall provide an assessment of existing water-dependent uses in the vicinity including, but not limited to navigation, fishing, hunting, pleasure boating, swimming, beach walking, picnicking and shoreline viewing and document potential impacts and mitigating measures. Impacts on these resources shall be considered in review of proposals and specific conditions to avoid or minimize impacts may be imposed.

Grant PUD’s Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) license has identified that upgrade of this launch facility as a necessary component of providing recreational access to the river.
REGULATION 47: Launch facilities within the natural environment are permitted as a conditional use. These launch facilities shall be limited to public access, interpretive or nature observation facilities that are compatible with the areas physical and visual character and the policies of this Program.

The application proposes to upgrade the launch ramp and provide supportive facilities only (parking, restroom, stormwater treatment, safety/interpretive signage).

5.8 FILLING, GRADING AND EXCAVATION
REGULATION 1: Filling, grading, and excavation shall be minimized to the maximum extent practicable and only authorized along with approved shoreline use and development activities that are consistent with this Program.

The amount of grading is the minimum necessary to facilitate the construction of the launch ramp, parking and other proposed support structures. The overall design of the facility focuses on minimizing grading due to the presence of numerous archaeological and historic finds in and around the immediate site.

REGULATION 2: Fills waterward of the ordinary high-water mark shall be allowed only when necessary to support:
   a. Water dependent use,
   b. Public access,
   c. Cleanup and disposal of contaminated sediments as part of an interagency environmental clean-up plan,
   d. Disposal of dredged materials considered suitable under, and conducted in accordance with the dredged materials management program of the Department of Natural Resources,
   e. Expansion or alteration of transportation facilities of statewide significance currently located on the shoreline and then only upon a demonstration that alternative to fill are not feasible.

Some fill is necessary to construct the ramp.

REGULATION 4: Filling, grading or excavation shall not be located where shoreline stabilization will be necessary to protect materials placed or removed. Disturbed areas shall be immediately stabilized and revegetated, as applicable.

The filling, grading, and excavation is designed for the construction of the ramp. Additional stabilization for the stabilization work will not be necessary.

REGULATION 5: Filling, grading, beach nourishment and excavation shall be designed to blend physically and visually with existing topography whenever possible, so as not to interfere with long-term appropriate use including lawful access and enjoyment of scenery.

The proposed work is to improve access to the water during the varied water conditions. The fill work is proposed on the launch ramp and mostly under water so the existing scenery will not be impacted. Due to the steep topography landward of the site; the minimal grading work will not interfere with any lawful access and enjoyment of scenery.
REGULATION 7: A temporary erosion and sediment control (TESC) plan, consistent with the standards found in the Stormwater Manual for Eastern Washington, shall be provided for all proposed filling, grading and excavation activities.

The nature of the ramp work proposed does not easily lend to a standard TESC Plan. Most of that work will take place in water therefore turbidity and siltation protection is proposed during all work and stabilization. The TESC plan will have to be specifically designed for this purpose in order to protect water quality and shoreline/aquatic functions designed and monitored by a Certified Erosion and Sediment Control Lead.

A Storm Water Pollution and Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is proposed within the plan sheets attached to the JARPA for all upland work. This plan must be implemented prior to commencing demolition work.

5.11 Recreation
REGULATION 1: Recreational development is a priority use of the shoreline. Preference is given to water-dependent uses such as fishing, swimming and boating. Water-related and water-enjoyment uses such as picnicking, hiking and walking are permitted provided they do not displace water-dependent uses and are consistent with the specific shoreline environment. Non-water related recreation facilities and/or support facilities such as parking lots shall be located in upland areas.

As noted in 6b of the JARPA this proposal is to minimally improve an informal boat launch. This location is one of a few launches on the eastern side of the Wanapum Reservoir and is the northernmost facility. Improving the launch ramp will facilitate increased access to the river during varied river conditions while reducing shoreline impacts. Construction of parking will allow additional boaters to use the facility while reducing impact to adjacent vegetation. Construction of the ADA transfer structure will disabled boaters to utilize the facility.

Appendix H, Chapter 2: Critical Areas – Wetlands
The construction of the launch ramp will impact the wetland adjacent to the ramp and it’s buffer.

Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Buffers overlap on this site. In both circumstances the mitigation ratios for buffer disturbance are the same. Buffer mitigation will not be ‘double charged’ because the impact occurs to both buffers. The discussion regarding buffer disturbance and compensatory mitigation can be found in the fish and wildlife habitat analysis below.

A Wetland Delineation and Rating dated revised August 2012 from Alliance Consulting Group was performed for the subject property. The delineation determined that three wetlands are present on the subject property and all three wetlands have a Category 3 rating.

The wetland and fish and wildlife habitat management and mitigation plan identifies that construction of the launch ramp will impact 80 square feet of wetland. The plan proposes 160 square feet of willow plantings within the old boat launch alignment.
planting plan is proposed on sheet 13 of 15 and 15 of 15, date 8/29/13 in the plan sheets attached to the JARPA.

As conditioned, the proposal is consistent with this section.

Appendix H, Chapter 3: Critical Areas – Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas
The construction of the launch ramp will impact the aquatic environment. Construction of the ramp and accessory uses will impact the aquatic habitat buffer.

An Aquatic Habitat Buffer Assessment dated December 30, 2013 from Anchor QEA was performed for the subject property. The assessment determines that the zone 1 and zone 2 buffers are applicable resulting in a 200 foot buffer from OHWM.

A fish and wildlife habitat management and mitigation plan has determined that a total of 2,100 square feet aquatic disturbance will result from the project. An additional 20,895 square feet of disturbance to the wetland and fish and wildlife habitat buffers has been identified. A portion of the fish and wildlife habitat buffer is overlapped by the 75 foot wetland buffer. In both circumstances the mitigation ratios for buffer disturbance are the same (2:1 native disturbance; 1:1 non-native disturbance). Buffer mitigation will not be ‘double charged’ because the impact occurs to both buffers. The application is proposing to mitigate the 2,100 sq. ft. of aquatic disturbance with 2,100 sq. ft. of riparian plantings. The 1,685 sq. ft. of buffer disturbance of riparian vegetation is proposed to be mitigated with 3,370 sq. ft of riparian plantings. The 19,210 sq. ft. of buffer disturbance of shrub steppe vegetation is proposed to be mitigated with 38,420 sq. ft. of shrub steppe plantings.

Due to site constraints (size, environmental conditions, archaeological resources) only a portion of the mitigation can be placed on-site. All of the 2,100 sq ft of the mitigation for the aquatic disturbance and 770 sq ft. of the riparian mitigation is proposed to be located on-site. The remaining 2,600 sq ft of riparian mitigation is proposed to be located downriver at the Columbia Cliffs site. The 38,420 square feet up shrub steppe mitigation is proposed to be located upright at the Columbia Siding site. For a vicinity map showing all three sites see the plan sheets attached to the JARPA. A more detailed discussion of the on- and off—site mitigation and the limitations can be found in Section 5.2.2 Compensation of the Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management and Mitigation Plan. Both off-site areas are owned by the Grant County PUD. Sections 2.035(H) and 3.037(G) within Appendix H of the shoreline master program authorize off-site mitigation if the mitigation cannot be accommodated on-site and the off-site areas are within the same watershed and within Douglas County. The two proposed sites meet this requirement. Planting plans for all three sites are proposed in the HMMP and on pages 13 thru 18 of the plan sheets attached to the JARPA.

As conditioned, the proposal is consistent with this section.

Consistency with WAC 173-27 and RCW 90.58:
As conditioned below, the project appears consistent with the requirements and criteria of the Shoreline Management and Enforcement Procedures, and the Shoreline Management Act.
Variance criteria WAC 173-27-170 (2)

a. That the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property.

An Aquatic Habitat Buffer Assessment determines that a 200 foot buffer from OHWM is appropriate. There is no portion of the district’s ownership in this area that is outside of the applicable buffer. The parking lot, ADA ramp and restroom cannot be placed outside of the buffer.

b. That the hardship described in (a) of this subsection is specifically related to the property, and is the result of unique conditions such as irregular lot shape, or natural features and the application of the master program, and not, for example, from deed restrictions or the applicant’s own actions.

The district’s ownership is governed by the project boundary for Wanapum Dam. This location evolved into an informal boat launch after the construction of the dam flooded the roadway which occurred prior to the establishment of the Shoreline Management Act and the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program.

c. That the design of the project is compatible with other authorized uses within the area and with uses planned for the area under the comprehensive plan and shoreline master program and will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

The proposal is for a low intensity, primitive boat launch facility. This design is significantly less extensive than other publicly owned boat launch facilities (Crescent Bar, Kirby Billingsley, Vantage) in the general area. Public access to the river is a central component of the shoreline master program. This proposal improves public access to the river in reach that is limited physically and ownership wise in its ability to accommodate public access. As stated above in the SMP analysis the project will not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

d. That the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by the other properties in the area.

The Grant County PUD owns most of the shoreline of the Wanapum pool and by this ownership is the primary provider of public launch access to this reach. Most properties in the area have the same limitations to public access to the river. This proposal will increase any non riverfront properties access to the river.

e. That the variance requested is the minimum necessary to afford relief.

No portion of the district’s property is located outside of the 200 foot buffer; therefore, the evaluation looks at minimizing the size to the minimum necessary and locating the facility as far away from OHWM as possible. The applicant has provided an alternatives analysis document that evaluates various sizes and configurations for a boat launch facility. The analysis resulted in a preferred alternative based on; requirements of the district’s FERC license, environmental impact, archaeological
The alternatives analysis documents that the overall size is the smallest possible.

The facility has been located as far back from the OHWM as possible while taking into account the following considerations. First, a significant volume of archaeological finds has been identified in and around the project site. The design has taken into account the minimum amount of excavation possible. Due to topography of the site moving the facility further inland would require grading and excavation which has a high likelihood of disturbing cultural resources. A more detailed discussion can be found in the Section 4.4 Archaeological Resources analysis above. Second, as much of the site as possible has been located over the existing informal facility in order to minimize the amount of new disturbance as possible. Third, if segregating the two areas would move the parking area out of the buffer then this option could be feasible. Since the district does not own any property outside the buffer; segregating the parking/Maneuver area from the launch ramp would necessitate the creation of a second maneuver area thus increasing the footprint of the disturbance.

The proposed size, configuration and location is the minimum necessary to afford relief.

f. That the public interest will suffer no substantial detrimental effect.

The public interest will not suffer detrimental effect. The proposal increases public access opportunities to the river. Environmental impacts have been evaluated and are proposed to be fully mitigated for. Archaeological impacts have been evaluated and are proposed to be addressed.

Consistency with Chapter 18.80.030 “Conditional Uses – Evaluation Criteria”

The proposal is for a low intensity, primitive boat launch facility. This level of use will be harmonious and in accordance with the comprehensive plan and with the existing and intended character of the general vicinity. Discussion regarding compliance with Items C thru H of this section can be found below in the specific criteria section of Chapter 18.80.315.

As conditioned the proposal is consistent with this section.

Consistency with Chapter 18.80.315 “Conditional Uses – Recreational Facilities”

A. General character. Development of recreational facilities shall be designed with an interior road network, perimeter landscaping or buffering mechanisms.

The nature of the use and the subject property does not require an interior road network. Screening and buffering are not necessary for this project. Please see the buffer analysis in section C below.
B. Minimum size. The minimum size for the establishment of a recreational facility is five acres, except for historical/cultural interpretative sites and water dependent activities.

*The proposal meets both criteria. The subject property is larger than 5 acres and is for a water dependent activity.*

C. Buffers. Buffering shall be required in a form adequate to provide site screening, noise attenuation, safety separation and reduction of light and glare. Acceptable methods of buffering include undulated berms, planting, sight-obscuring fencing, security fencing or any combination thereof. At least two of these buffering methods shall be incorporated into the design of the project to off-set impacts to surrounding properties from higher intensity uses. Buffer and landscaping shall meet the minimum provisions as set forth in DCC Chapter 20.40 and maintained throughout the life of the project.

*The proposal is for a low intensity, primitive boat launch. The adjacent property is zoned and approved for a Master Planned Resort (Spanish Castle). The planned adjacent uses will be of a much higher intensity (commercial/multi-family residential in a recreational/resort setting). Additionally, the adjacent property is at a much higher elevation. Buffering and screening are not necessary for this proposal.*

D. Light and glare. Any outdoor lighting shall be directed towards the site and/or shielded in accordance with DCC Chapter 18.16.

*No outdoor lighting is proposed.*

E. Parking. Adequate off-street parking shall be provided for the expected average use and off-street accommodations shall be made for expected peak use. The number of parking spaces required shall be based on the level of public demand and the number of public seating areas proposed. Parking and loading standards shall be in compliance with the minimum standards set forth in DCC Chapter 20.42.

*The application is proposing 12 parking spaces. Two passenger vehicle spaces and 10 tow vehicle spaces. The total number of spaces were determined through an alternatives analysis which has taken into account the District’s FERC License requirements, critical areas protection, archaeological impacts and variance criteria requirements.*

F. Access. Access drives shall be constructed in a manner to safely carry the expected traffic flow. Provisions shall be made to limit access to the site to a maximum of two points, unless additional access points are deemed necessary in order to protect the public health, safety and welfare. Specific design requirements for width and type of surface shall be determined by the review authority pursuant to DCC title 12, DCC Chapter 18.16 and other applicable sections of the DCC.

*Transportation services and the county fire marshal have commented primitive nature of the road accessing the launch facility. After a meeting between the Board of County*
Commissioners and Grant County PUD, transportation services has provided comment requiring a temporary and permanent signage plan identifying the primitive nature of the road (see transportation comments – March 4, 2014). An engineered signage plan dated received May 1, 2015 was submitted by the applicant. The fire marshal identified that the access road must be improved with two wide spots to facilitate vehicles passing each other along the access (see fire marshal comments – October 28, 2014).

G. Solid waste management. Provisions shall be made for refuse disposal by a licensed commercial hauler approved by the Douglas County department of solid waste, or successor agency. All outdoor trash, garbage and refuse storage areas shall be screened from all sides from public view and be designed of such materials which are compatible with the overall architectural theme of the associated structure or use.

*Trash receptacles will be provided and maintained by the district. No dumpsters are proposed.*

H. Signs. All signs used in conjunction with the proposed use shall meet the minimum provisions of DCC Chapter 20.44.

*An engineered signage plan dated received May 1, 2015 was submitted by the applicant to cover on-site signage and traffic signage (primitive road, no parking). The proposed signage meets the requirements of DCC 20.44.*

I. Fire safety. Provisions shall be made for fire safety. All development activity shall meet the minimum provisions for fire suppression pursuant to DCC Title 15 and as approved by the fire marshal. No permit shall be issued until the applicant has shown that the fire chief of the fire protection district or as contracted with the nearest fire district in which the use is to be located has approved fire protection devices and equipment to be available during the use.

*The project proposal does not rise to the level of requiring water for fire suppression. The fire marshal identified that the access road must be improved with two wide spots to facilitate vehicles passing each other along the access (see fire marshal comments – October 28, 2014).*

J. Emergency response. An analysis shall be conducted by the applicant for emergency assistance which may include fire, law enforcement, and medical services. The analysis shall include conformation that the minimum local and state codes and regulations have been met including WAC Chapter 248-73 when applicable. Any additional costs of providing such services shall be the applicant’s expense.

*An emergency response analysis, dated July 16, 2014 from Project Groundwork has been provided with the application. The analysis concludes that there is little likelihood that the proposed improvements will impact the Fire District and Sheriff’s office ability to provide adequate emergency services. The sheriff’s office and fire marshal provided*
comment on this application and did not indicate that the proposal will negatively impact emergency services.

K. Health and utilities. Adequate provisions, verified in writing by the appropriate agency with expertise, shall be made for sanitary sewer, domestic water for public use, irrigation water for landscape maintenance, and/or other health and safety related concerns as deemed necessary.

The proposal includes the installation of a restroom (pit toilet) and trash receptacles all of which will be maintained by the district.

L. Amplified sound. No sound-amplifying device or speaker emitting loud and raucous noise shall be operated closer than two thousand five hundred feet from any school, church or residence, unless the governing body and/or owner of each such use has agreed in writing to waive this prohibition.

No sound amplifying devices are proposed.

M. Noise. Uses and activities shall not exceed the maximum environmental noise level established by DCC Chapter 8.04 or WAC 173-60, as administered by the Douglas County Sheriff.

The proposal is for a primitive boat launch facility. The intensity of this use is not expected to generate noise that will exceed maximum environmental noise levels.

N. Agricultural interface. When a use, lot, or parcel is proposed for recreational development and adjoins or is within an agricultural district, all uses, including the storage of materials shall be setback a minimum of one hundred feet from the property line. Buildings, structures and/or uses may setback a minimum of sixty feet from the property line, provided the applicant submits an enhanced alternative buffering method for approval by the review authority.

The subject property does not adjoin nor is it within an agricultural district.

O. Resource/Critical Areas. It shall be the responsibility of the operator and/or proprietor of any permitted use to provide, analyze and make adequate provisions for the protection of groundwater, wetlands, sensitive wildlife species, resource lands, and other critical areas in accordance with DCC Title 19. Development located within the above areas shall be evaluated for impacts and may be limited in intensity, location and/or prohibited if found to measurably degrade the integrity of the resource or critical areas.

A detailed discussion regarding critical areas impacts and mitigation can be found above in the shoreline master program critical areas analysis.
P. Dimensional standards. Yard, setback and height regulations for the recreational facility are the same as those in the zoning district in which the project is proposed; except that any buffering required through the site approval process may exceed the fence height restrictions enumerated in DCC Chapter 18.16.

The proposed structure will meet the 25 foot height limit within the shoreline master program for the Natural environment designation. Currently a county right-of-way extends down the access and launch ramp to the water as this facility is an old road. This right-of-way creates property lines which any structure must be set back from.

The applicant has requested a vacation of this portion of the county right-of-way. A public hearing on the vacation was held by the Board of County Commissioners on April 7, 2015. The BOCC has granted conditional approval of the vacation. As of the writing of this staff report this vacation has not been completed.

Any proposed structures will have to meet front yard setbacks to this right-of-way if a building permit is to be issued prior to the vacation being completed.

Q. Air emissions. Development and operation or recreational faculties shall not disseminate dust, smoke, fumes, or obnoxious odors nor degrade air quality.

The proposal is for a primitive boat launch facility. The intensity of this use will not generate air emissions that will degrade air quality.

R. Financial assurance. The review authority may require a bond, cash deposit or other form of financial assurance pursuant to DCC Chapter 14.90. Financial assurance may be required for the duration of the activity on an annual basis prior to the scheduled use. Financial surety shall be provided:

1. As an indemnity to protect and repair roads, pavements, bridges, road signs, and other public property from any and all damage that may be caused by vehicles, employees or participants in the uses proposed;
2. To restore the ground where the use is held, on county land or other properties;
3. To pay the cost of employment of such county personnel as may be made necessary, by the failure to preclude acts which violate this chapter or any county or state law;
4. Other purposes as determined by the review authority.

As a general policy, the county does not require financial assurance for the completion of projects by public entities.

S. Insurance. The review authority may require that the applicant(s) have personal injury liability insurance in a form and an amount acceptable to the prosecuting attorney.

It is staff's opinion that personal liability insurance is not needed for approval of this application. Insurance needs are an analysis made by the District's legal counsel as a matter of operation of all of their recreation facilities.
VIII. RECOMMENDATION

As conditioned below, this application does not appear to be detrimental to the general public health, safety or welfare and meets the basic intent and criteria associated with Title 18 and 19 of the Douglas County Code, the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan, and the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program. Staff recommends approval of SP-13-14, SCUP-13-01, SV-13-01, CUP-13-02, subject to the following findings of fact and conditions:

Suggested Findings of Fact

1. The applicant is Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County, PO Box 878, Ephrata WA.

2. General Description: An application submitted by Grant County PUD for a shoreline substantial development permit, a shoreline conditional use permit, a shoreline variance and a conditional use permit for upgrading the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch site. Site improvements include: constructing an improved boat ramp, improving the access and maneuver area, installing 10 parking spaces, constructing an ADA transfer platform and single vault toilet, installing ADA access, stormwater improvements, signage and trash receptacles.

3. The subject property is described as being located within the SW Quarter of Section 9, Township 20N., Range 22 E., W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The shoreline designation is Natural. The Douglas County Assessor's Parcel Number is 20220920003.

4. The comprehensive plan designation is Rural Resource 20 acres.

5. The subject property is zoned RR-20

6. The Columbia River Shoreline section of the subject property is designated as "Natural" by the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program.

7. Public launch ramps are a conditional use in the natural shoreline environment.

8. Parking accessory to a permitted use is a conditional use in the natural shoreline environment.

9. This subject site is an existing primitive county road that accesses the shoreline. The road bed was flooded in 1959 when the construction of Wanapum Dam raised the river level. Since this time the site, where the road enters the water, has been used as an informal boat launch. No county permits have been issued for this facility.

10. WAC 173-27-150 establishes minimum review criteria for Shoreline Management Substantial Development Permits. This criteria states that a substantial development permit shall be granted only when the development proposed is consistent with the policies and procedures of the Act; the provisions of this regulation; and the applicable master program adopted or approved for the area.

11. WAC 173-27-170 (2) establishes minimum review criteria for Shoreline Variances.

12. No portion of the District's property is located outside of the applicable Aquatic Habitat Buffer. Therefore the strict application of the bulk, dimensional or performance standards set forth in the applicable master program precludes, or significantly interferes with, reasonable use of the property.
13. The district’s ownership is governed by the project boundary for Wanapum Dam and therefore the hardship is related to the property and not the result of the applicant’s actions.

14. The proposal is for a launch facility that is significantly less intensive that other public launch facilities in the general area and has been determined to not cause adverse impacts to the shoreline environment.

15. This variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege not enjoyed by other properties in the area.

16. The facility has been designed to be the smallest possible size consistent with the district’s FERC license requirements, environmental, and archaeological constraints. Locating the new facility over the existing disturbance reduces archaeological impacts and minimizes additional disturbance to the buffer. The proposed size, configuration and location is the minimum necessary to afford relief.

17. The public interest will not suffer detrimental effect. The proposal increases public access opportunities to the river. Environmental impacts have been evaluated and are proposed to be fully mitigated for. Archaeological impacts have been evaluated and are proposed to be addressed.

18. A Wetland Delineation and Rating dated revised August 2012 from Alliance Consulting Group was performed for the subject property. The delineation determined that three wetlands are present on the subject property and all three wetlands have a Category 3 rating.

19. Section 2.035 (H) of the shoreline master program, appendix H identifies that Category 3 wetland disturbance shall require a 2:1 mitigation ratio for restablishment/creation. Buffer disturbance shall require a 2:1 mitigation ratio for native vegetation disturbance and a 1:1 mitigation ratio for non-native vegetation disturbance.

20. An Aquatic Habitat Buffer Assessment dated December 30, 2013 from Anchor QEA was performed for the subject property. The assessment determines that the zone 1 and zone 2 buffers are applicable resulting in a 200 foot buffer from OHWM.

21. A wetland and fish and wildlife habitat management and mitigation plan dated December 2013, revised August 2014; revised March 2015 was developed for the project by Anchor QEA.

22. Sections 2.035(H) and 3.037(G) within Appendix H of the shoreline master program authorize off-site mitigation if the mitigation cannot be accommodated on-site and the off-site areas are within the same watershed and within Douglas County. The two proposed off-site mitigation areas meet these requirements.

23. The mitigation proposed in the Wetlands and Fish and Wildlife Management and Mitigation Plan meets the requirements of the Douglas County Regional Shoreline Master Program.


25. The applicant has provided communication from May 13, 1013, September 9, 2013 and October 30, 2013 from the District’s Senior Archaeologist to the WA Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation. This communication documents that the project will have an adverse effect on a registered archaeological site and commencement of a memorandum of agreement for resolution of the adverse effect.

26. No public comments were received.
27. Grant County PUD is SEPA Lead Agency for this project and has issued a Determination of Nonsignificance in accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2) on October 1, 2013.

28. A county right-of-way currently exists along the access road and down the informal launch ramp to the ordinary high water mark. Grant County PUD has applied for a vacation of the right-of-way within the boundaries of their property. A public hearing was held on April 7, 2015 by the Douglas County Board of Commissioners to consider the vacation. The BOCC has conditionally approved the vacation. To date, the vacation process has not been completed.

29. Surrounding property owners were given the opportunity to comment on the proposals, can request a copy of the decision, and can appeal the decision subject to the requirements outlined in DCC Title 14.

30. Proper legal requirements were met and surrounding property owners were given the opportunity to comment on the proposal at a public hearing.

31. WAC 173-27-090 requires that construction must be commenced within 2 years of the effective date of the shoreline permit and that authorization for construction shall terminate 5 years after the effective date of the shoreline permit.

32. As conditioned, the development will not adversely affect the general public, health, safety and general welfare.

Suggested Conclusions:

1. As conditioned, the development meets the goals, policies and implementation recommendations as set forth in the Douglas County Countywide Comprehensive Plan and the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program.
2. As conditioned, this proposal is consistent with applicable federal and state laws and regulations.
3. As conditioned, the proposal meets the minimum review criteria for Shoreline Variances found in WAC 173-27-170 (2).
4. As conditioned, the proposal is consistent with DCC 18.80.030 General Evaluation Criteria and DCC 18.80-315 Recreational Facilities.
5. As proposed, revised, and conditioned, potential impacts of the project can be mitigated.
6. Public interests will be served by approval of this proposal.
7. As conditioned, the proposal is consistent with Title 18 “Zoning” and Title 19 “Environment” of the Douglas County Code.

Suggested Conditions of Approval

1. The project shall proceed in substantial conformance with the plans and application materials of file submitted on October 10, 2013, August 21, 2014, March 12, 2015, and May 1, 2015 except as amended by the conditions herein.
2. The applicant shall comply with all applicable local, state and federal regulations.
3. A copy of this permit and attached conditions shall be kept on-site and provided to the contractor and all others working within the shoreline area at all times. The applicant, contractor, machinery operators and all others working within the shoreline area shall have read this permit and attached conditions and shall follow its conditions at all times.
4. Proximity of this project to the Columbia River will likely trigger the threshold used by the Washington State Department of Ecology in administering their General Permit to Apricot Orchards
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Discharge Storm Water Associated with Construction Activity. If required, the permit shall be obtained prior to beginning ground-breaking activities. Acquisition of this permit is the responsibility of the applicant.

5. Prior to the commencement of demolition/excavation; the storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) shall be implemented.

6. In the event that human remains. Burials, funerary items, sacred objects or objects of cultural patrimony are found during project implementation, the proponent or his authorized agent shall adhere to all of the requirements of RCW 68.50.645. They shall immediately cease any activity which may cause further disturbance and then take steps to protect the find from further damage or disruption. They shall then contact the county coroner, who will contact the WA Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Historic Preservation Officer for the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. No further work shall be allowed on the project until there is an approved plan for managing or preserving the remains or items.

7. In the event that prehistoric artifacts (i.e. arrowheads, spear points, mortars, pestles, other ground stone tools, knives, scrapers, or flakes from the manufacture of tools, fire pits, peeled trees, etc.) or historic period artifacts or features (i.e. fragments of old plates or ceramic vessels, weathered glass, dumps of old cans, cabins, root cellars etc.) are found during project implementation, the proponent or his authorized agent shall cease work immediately within 200 feet of the find. They shall contact the WA Dept. of Archaeology and Historic Preservation and the Historic Preservation Officer for the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. No further work shall be allowed on the project until there is an approved plan for managing or preserving the artifacts or features.

8. Any building permits issued before the completion of the road vacation process must meet appropriate setbacks.

9. Prior to scheduling the final inspection for required building permits, the engineer of record shall provide written verification that the storm design in the July 2014 Stormwater Analysis was installed per plan.

10. Prior to scheduling the final inspection for required building permits, the Declaration of Stormwater System Maintenance Covenants will be recorded with the Douglas County Auditor.

11. The project application shall proceed consistent with the Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management and Mitigation Plan prepared by Anchor QEA, dated December 2013, revised August 2014; revised March 2015, except as may be amended by the conditions herein.

12. Irrigation shall be installed, as necessary, for the survival of the mitigation plantings. Said design shall address the specific needs of riparian vegetation.

13. A five year monitoring period shall commence upon placement of the planting materials.

14. The mitigation sites shall be maintained to ensure the management and mitigation plan objectives are successful. Maintenance shall ensure 100% survival for the first year and 80% survival during years 2 thru 5 of the monitoring period and shall include corrective actions to rectify problems, include rigorous, as-needed elimination of undesirable plants; protection of shrubs and small trees from competition by grasses and herbaceous plants, and repair and replacement of any dead plants.

15. Monitoring reports shall be submitted to Douglas County Transportation and Land Services 1 year after mitigation installation; 3 years after mitigation installation; and 5 years after mitigation installation. Monitoring reports shall be submitted by a qualified biologist, as defined by Douglas County Code. The biologist must verify that the
conditions of approval and provisions in the Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management and Mitigation Plan prepared by Anchor QEA, dated December 2013, revised August 2014; revised March 2015 have been satisfied. Planting plans for all three sites are proposed in the HMMP and on pages 13 thru 18 of the plan sheets attached to the JARPA.

16. If at the conclusion of the 5 year monitoring period, 80% survivability is not achieved, then corrective actions as outlined in Condition #14 shall be taken and yearly monitoring shall continue until 80% survivability can be demonstrated from the previous year.

17. Where a condition imposed herein may be found inconsistent with the requirements of the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife, HPA Permit, or permitting issued by the United States Army Corps of Engineers, the Douglas County Land Services Director shall have discretion to allow for project redesign consistent with the approvals granted by said agencies; if the redesign can be found consistent with the Douglas County Code, the Shoreline Master Program, and the Shoreline Management Act.

18. Construction of the project for which this permit has been granted must be commenced within two (2) years of the effective date of this permit. Authorization to conduct development activities granted by the permit shall terminate five (5) years from the filing date of the permit.

Respectfully Submitted,

Curtis Lillquist, A.I.C.P.
Principal Planner

Attachments
Appendix A
Good afternoon David,

The access to the boat launch is far less than desirable. However, based on the use, available parking and the posting of no parking signs on the road the fire department can work with the access. The map I viewed showed the possibility of creating wide spots in the road, ideally two, that would allow vehicles to pass one another. I recommend we pursue this option with the pull out length able to accommodate a vehicle pulling a boat trailer.

If this is unfeasible; lets revisit the plan.

Thank you,

Brian Brett
Assistant Chief / Fire Marshal
Douglas County Fire District #2
377 Eastmont Ave
East Wenatchee, WA. 98802
(509) 884-6671

>>> David Stipe <dstipe@projectgroundwork.com> 10/28/2014 8:32 AM >>>
Brian,

Thank you for meeting with Igor and I yesterday regarding access to the existing and propose Apricot Orchard Boat Launch. We appreciated your time and understanding of the topographic and environmental issues that limit our abilities to provide a full size turn around and 20’ access corridor.

Our understanding following the meeting is that you a comfortable with the size of the turnaround and the width of the access as they are proposed in the JARPA drawings dates 8/29/13. We however at your request will attempt to provide one pull out per DCC 12.53.010(c)3b for private driveway pull outs. While this is not a private drive it is the closest standard in the DCC that provides guidance on pull outs. If this should prove to be unfeasible for habitat and/or topographic reasons, I left our meeting with the understanding that you would be comfortable with the improvements as proposed.

If you could please confirm our understanding with a follow up email to all of those copied I would very much appreciate it.

Regards,
This communication may contain privileged or other confidential information. If you have received it in error, please advise the sender by reply email and immediately delete the message and any attachments without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.
Jennifer,

I was able to review this with Curt and it looks acceptable to me.

Please let me know if you have any concerns.

Thank you,

From: jlange@co.douglas.wa.us [mailto:jlange@co.douglas.wa.us]
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 10:07 AM
To: c1i11guist@co.douglas.wa.us; Brian Brett
Cc: dbramlette@co.douglas.wa.us; cpeterson@co.douglas.wa.us; jlange@co.douglas.wa.us
Subject: RE: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch

If they are constructing improvements within County ROW a permit to perform work in the ROW will be required. Plans showing what, how, where the improvements will be constructed will also be necessary.

(Note- concurrently there are plans in process for the Master Planned Resort... the County has encouraged both parties to work together, but they have opted to run projects/improvements independently.)

JL

From: Curtis Lillquist (x6588)
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 9:24 AM
To: 'Brian Brett'; Jennifer Lange (x6542)
Subject: RE: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch

At what point does the pullout need to be constructed?

Curtis

From: Brian Brett <bbrett@douglasfire2.org>
Sent: Thursday, April 09, 2015 9:03 AM
To: Curtis Lillquist (x6588)
Subject: RE: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch

Curtis,

I have spoken with them and they were going to have a pullout along the way.

I would be happy to go over it again with them.
Thank you for the update,

Brian Brett  
Assistant Chief/Fire Marshal  
Douglas County Fire District #2  
377 Eastmont Ave.  
East Wenatchee, WA. 98802  
W (509) 884-6671 C (509) 669-1902 F (509) 884-9521

From: clillquist@co.douglas.wa.us [mailto:clillquist@co.douglas.wa.us]  
Sent: Wednesday, April 08, 2015 5:18 PM  
To: Brian Brett  
Subject: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch

Brian,

Has Grant County PUD contacted you regarding emergency vehicle access down to the launch? Transportation’s comments were that the County was not going to require an upgrade of the road below the railroad tracks just for the launch improvements but that the Fire Marshall might require some improvement (i.e. pull outs) for emergency vehicle access.

Thanks

Curtis Lillquist, A.I.C.P.  
Principal Planner – Development Services  
Douglas County Transportation and Land Services  
140 19th St. NW  
East Wenatchee WA 98801  
(509) 884-7173  
cclillquist@co.douglas.wa.us
February 5, 2014

Mr. Curtis Lillquist  
Douglas County Transportation and Land Services  
140 19th Street NW  
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

Dear Mr. Lillquist:

RE: Ecology Comments for the Proposed Apricot Orchards Boat Launch Improvement Project

Thank you for sending a copy of the application for the proposed Apricot Orchards Boat Launch Improvement Project to the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) for our review and comment. I am the Ecology Wetland/Shoreland Specialist responsible for Douglas County and wish to have the following comments entered for the record. The project site is located within the SW Quarter of Section 9, Township 20N, Range 22E, W.M., Douglas County, WA (Douglas County Tax Parcel No. 20220920003).

The applicant has stated in the application materials that the specific site and use conditions for this public recreation improvement project are extraordinary and unique circumstances. The applicant further asserts that strict implementation of the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program (SMP) would impose unnecessary hardship on the applicant and states that the project is consistent with Douglas County SMP 6.8 Variances and WAC 173-27-170 review criteria for variance permits. Ecology has reviewed the land use application materials submitted by Grant County PUD to Douglas County Transportation and Land Services for the proposed Apricot Orchard Boat Launch Improvement Project, and determined the application materials do not sufficiently address the criteria for variance permits outlined in WAC 173-170. In order for Ecology to determine if the project meets WAC 173-27-170 variance requirements, the applicant shall provide a substantive analysis of the project proposal outlining how each requirement of the variance criteria is met.

If you have any questions or would like to discuss my comments, please give me a call at (509) 454-4260 or send an email to ajed461@ecy.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Andrea Jedel, PWS  
Wetland/Shoreland Specialist  
Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program
February 12, 2014

Mr. Curtis Lillquist
Transportation and Land Use Services
140 19th Street NW
East Wenatchee, WA 98802

In future correspondence please refer to:
Log: 052013-13-FERC
Property: SP-13-14, SCUP-13-01, SV-13-01, CUP-13-02, Apricot Orchard Boat Launch and Site Improvements
Re: Archaeology-Permit from DAHP Required (RCW 27.53)

Dear Mr. Lillquist:

Thank you for contacting the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP). The above referenced project has been reviewed on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer. The proposed improvements and boat launch will intersect with archaeological site 45D0673. A permit from DAHP will be required under RCW 27.53. Alternately a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) as requested by Dr. Rob Whitlam, State Archaeologist, DAHP (see attached letter dated November 7, 2013) under the FERC license could be submitted for review. In absence of that a permit application prepared by a professional archaeologist should be submitted. Please be aware that it can take between 45 and 60 days to receive the DAHP permit after a sufficient permit application is received. No ground disturbance may take place until the permit has been issued and received.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Kaehler
Local Governments Archaeologist
(360) 586-3088
gretchen.kaehler@dahp.wa.gov

cc. Rex Buck, Cultural Resources, Wanapum Tribe
    Johnson Meninick, Cultural Resources, Yakama Nation
    Kate Valdez, THPO, Yakama Nation
    Rob Whitlam, State Archaeologist, DAHP
November 7, 2013

Mr. Aaron Kuntz
Grant County PUD No. 2
PO Box 878
Ephrata, Washington 98823

Re: Apricot Orchard Boat Launch Project
FERC # 2114
Log No.: 052013-13-FERC

Dear Mr. Kuntz:

Thank you for contacting our department regarding the proposed treatment of Adverse Effect for the Apricot Orchard Boat Launch Project in Douglas County, Washington.

Please find attached a recent Memorandum of Agreement that serve as a model for resolution of Adverse Effect under the FERC License. Please also note the elements for reporting, curation, public presentations, and dispute resolution.

We would also appreciate receiving any correspondence or comments from concerned tribes or other parties that you receive as you consult under the requirements of 36CFR800.4(a)(4).

These comments are based on the information available at the time of this review and on behalf of the State Historic Preservation Officer in compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, and its implementing regulations 36CFR800.4. Should additional information become available, our assessment may be revised, including information regarding historic properties that have not yet been identified.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and we look forward further discussions.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Whitlam, Ph.D.
State Archaeologist
(360) 586-3080
email: rob.whitlam@dahp.wa.gov
DOUGLAS COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AND LAND SERVICES
LAND USE APPLICATION
COMMENT SHEET

Name of Applicant: Grant County PUD
Date of Application: October 10, 2013

Date of Letter of Completeness Issued: January 7, 2014

Application Number: SP-13-14, SCUP-13-01, SV-13-01, CUP-13-02

Description of Proposal: An application for a shoreline substantial development permit, a shoreline conditional use permit, a shoreline variance and a conditional use permit for upgrading the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch site. Site improvements include: constructing an improved boat ramp, improving the access and maneuver area, installing 10 parking spaces, constructing an ADA transfer platform and single vault toilet, installing ADA access, stormwater improvements, signage and trash receptacles. The subject property is described as being located within the SW Quarter of Section 9, Township 20N., Range 22 E., W.M., Douglas County, Washington. The shoreline designation is Natural. The Douglas County Assessor’s Parcel Number is 20220920003

RESPOND BY: 5:00 p.m., February 13, 2014

RETURN COMMENTS TO: Attn: Curtis Lillquist
Douglas County Transportation & Land Services
140 19th Street N.W.
East Wenatchee, WA 98802
clillquist@co.douglas.wa.us

If comments are not received from your agency by the above date it will be construed that your agency has no concern with this application.

SIGNED: ____________________ DATE: 02/06/2014
AGENCY NAME: Douglas County SHERIFF'S OFFICE
Date: 02/06/2014

Application Number: SP-13-14, SCUP-13-01, SV-13-01, CUP-13-02

From: Sergeant Paul J Downs, Douglas County Sheriff's Office

Comments: This agency has no concerns with this application.

The improvements listed in the application for this site will benefit this agency by reducing our response time to launch patrol vessels on the Wanapum Pool. Currently we have to use the Crescent Bar launch for routine and emergency launches. The proposed launch improvements will reduce our emergency and routine launch times.
Hi Curtis,

This morning I had a phone conversation with Debbie Knaub from Grant County PUD and Ben Floyd of Anchor QEA, discussing my two comments that I’d provided you regarding Grant County PUD’s Apricot Orchard Boat Launch project. I am sending this email to you at their request for documentation of our discussion.

My prior comments and discussed resolution are as follows:

1. The project proponent states that the project includes work on currently degraded, unvegetated land primarily in use for parking and is not included in the calculation of impact area for purposes of identifying mitigation requirements. Douglas County SMP Appendix H, Chapter 2 requires mitigation of wetland buffers at 1:1 for non-native disturbance and 2:1 for native disturbance. Ecology recommends the project proponent provide mitigation areas for areas disturbed in accordance to Douglas County’s SMP. Ecology does not recommend granting credit, and not providing mitigation for, existing unpermitted disturbance in wetland buffers.

   The project proponent agrees to expand the discussion of off-site mitigation areas and mitigation ratios in the Habitat Management Plan. With inclusion of the off-site mitigation area, Ecology agrees that mitigation for non-native disturbance is adequately provided for.

2. Identify ownership and access rights to the proposed off-site mitigation area. Ecology recommends placement of the off-site mitigation area in a conservation easement, deed restriction, or similar recorded notice with the County’s assessor.

   The project proponent agrees and will clarify ownership and access rights to the proposed off-site mitigation areas.

Please call if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you.

Andrea

Andrea Jedel, PWS
Department of Ecology | Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program | (509) 454-4260 | aied461@ecy.wa.gov
Hi Ben,

Thank you for forwarding revised materials for the Apricot Orchard Boat Launch project. I have reviewed through the materials and concur that the revisions accurately reflect our discussion and provide the needed clarity to address my prior review comment listed in your email. I have no further comments on the project.

Thank you,
Andrea

Andrea Jedel, PWS  
Department of Ecology | Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program | (509) 454-4260 | ajed461@ecy.wa.gov

Hi Andrea,

This email is being sent on behalf of Grant PUD in follow up to our phone conversation on Thursday, November 6 regarding the Apricot Orchard Boat Launch Wetland and Fish and Wildlife Habitat plan. The purpose of the call was to clarify how Anchor QEA, on behalf of Grant PLIO, intended to respond to your comment made to Douglas County. The comment is provided for reference:

1. The project proponent states that the project includes work on currently degraded, unvegetated land primarily in use for parking and is not included in the calculation of impact area for purposes of identifying mitigation requirements. Douglas County SMP Appendix H, Chapter 2 requires mitigation of wetland buffers at 1:1 for non-native disturbance and 2:1 for native disturbance. Ecology recommends the project proponent provide mitigation areas for areas disturbed in accordance to Douglas County’s SMP. Ecology does not recommend granting credit, and not providing mitigation for, existing unpermitted disturbance in wetland buffers.

In our conversation on Thursday you indicated that it wasn’t clear how we had addressed mitigation for impacts to the wetland buffer, and also why there was a need for having both an on and off-site mitigation strategy. We are updating the document and associated figures to identify where the wetland buffer is located, where the impacts to wetland buffer occur, and also clarify how the proposed mitigation included compensating for impacts to the wetland buffer in addition to the Fish & Wildlife Habitat buffer. In the previously submitted mitigation document, mitigation identified as riparian mitigation can be interpreted as addressing impacts to vegetation within the wetland buffer also. Revisions are being made to clarify this issue.

Attached is the revised text excerpt and also two updated figures that we believe more clearly identifies the location of the wetland buffer, and location of the wetland buffer impacts, further demonstrating that within the wetland buffer,
there are both riparian and shrub-steppe vegetation types. Similarly, within the Fish and Wildlife Habitat buffer, there are both types of vegetation.

We are also requesting you confirm our discussion about mitigation for the wetland buffer, including the language you referenced in Appendix H-2 Section 2.035(H) Mitigation Ratios. After the mitigation ratios table the following paragraph states:

"The mitigation ratios (mitigation amount:disturbed area) for impacts to the wetland buffer are 1:1 for development within the buffer; and a ratio of 2:1 for native vegetation removal within a buffer..."

As we discussed on the phone, ecological functions are not provided by the existing parking in the existing disturbed and unvegetated area. The existing disturbed area within the wetland buffer is part of baseline conditions that existed at the time of the SMP update (adopted in 2009), and has limited the wetland buffer functionality in this location since the time the development came into existence. This disturbed area will only be temporarily impacted during construction, and in fact the area will be improved with stormwater management features. Further, the proposed on-site mitigation will restore portions of the disturbed or degraded areas, which will increase overall ecological function within the watershed when combined with the proposed off-site mitigation.

Because the existing disturbed and unvegetated area within the wetland buffer does not provide ecological functions, there are no impacts to wetland buffer functions to mitigate for. We are confident the proposed on-site and off-site combined mitigation strategy also meets the no net loss requirement.

Finally, the proposal to complete off-site mitigation for impacts to shrub-steppe vegetation within the FWHB was based on the presence of moderately functioning shrub-steppe habitat at the Apricot Orchard project area. The shrub-steppe community in the project area is not suitable for large-scale restoration. At most, the shrub-steppe vegetation community at this site suffers from some encroachment of invasive species, but in many areas the cryptogram crust is undisturbed, and doing ground-disturbing restoration activities at this site could prove more harmful to the overall resilience of the vegetation community. In addition, ground disturbing activities at this site are constrained through the presence of significant areas of cultural resources and culturally sensitive sites. Because of this, Grant PUD indicated a preference for looking at another Grant PUD-owned property to use for purposes of shrub-steppe mitigation. The Columbia Siding site offers an opportunity to make improvements at a site that with significant ecological disturbance.

Can you review our information provide in this email along with the attached information to see if it adequately addresses your comments and questions, and also meets your understanding of the relevant requirements in the Douglas County SMP?

Thanks,

Ben Floyd

ANCHOR QEA, LLC
bflloyd@anchorgea.com
8033 W. Grandridge Blvd., Suite A
Kennewick, WA 99336
T 509.491.3151 x102
C 509.539.3366

ANCHOR QEA, LLC
www.anchorgea.com

Please consider the environment before printing this email.
This electronic message transmission contains information that may be confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of litigation. The information is intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying distribution or use of the contents of this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify us by telephone at (206) 287-9130.
Hi Curtis,

No, I do not have any comments on the application meeting the criteria for approval of a shoreline variance.

Thanks,
Andrea

Hi Andrea,

Do you have any comments regarding their application meeting the criteria for approval of a shoreline variance?

Curtis

Hi Curtis,

Thank you for sending additional information pertaining to the Grant County PUD Apricot Orchards Boat Launch project for review and comment. I have a couple of comments from my review, listed below. Ecology's water quality program has also reviewed the drawings and may have some additional comments pertaining to permeability of the proposed gravel surfacing. When they are available, I will forward them along to you.

Shoreline and Environmental Assistance Program comments on Apricot Orchards Boat Launch Improvements:

1. The project proponent states that the project includes work on currently degraded, unvegetated land primarily in use for parking and is not included in the calculation of impact area for purposes of identifying mitigation requirements. Douglas County SMP Appendix H, Chapter 2 requires mitigation of wetland buffers at 1:1 for non-native disturbance and 2:1 for native disturbance. Ecology recommends the project proponent provide mitigation areas for areas disturbed in accordance to Douglas County's SMP. Ecology does not recommend granting credit, and not providing mitigation for, existing unpermitted disturbance in wetland buffers.
2. Identify ownership and access rights to the proposed off-site mitigation area. Ecology recommends placement of the off-site mitigation area in a conservation easement, deed restriction, or similar recorded notice with the County’s assessor.

Please call if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you,
Andrea

Andrea Jedel, PWS
Department of Ecology | Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program | (509) 454-4260 | ajed461@ecy.wa.gov

This email may be subject to disclosure as a public record under the Public Records Act, RCW Chapter 42.56
Curtis Lillquist (x6588)

From: Jedel, Andrea (ECY) <ajed461@ECY.WA.GOV>
Sent: Thursday, October 02, 2014 8:42 AM
To: Curtis Lillquist (x6588)
Subject: Permeable Gravel and Apricot Orchards Boat Launch

Curtis,

Ecology’s Water Quality section has some additional comments on the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch proposal. Please see the email threads below. If you or the applicant has concern about the request, please feel free to contact Mark Peterschmidt directly for clarification.

Andrea Jedel, PWS
Department of Ecology | Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program | (509) 454-4260 | ajed461@ecy.wa.gov

From: Howie, Douglas (ECY)
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2014 8:22 AM
To: Peterschmidt, Mark F. (ECY)
Cc: Jedel, Andrea (ECY); Wittmeier, Terry (ECY)
Subject: RE: Permeable Gravel?

Mark:

I don’t know of anything called “permeable gravel” and I don’t know how a gravel roadway can maintain permeability over time.

I think they need to show us more than a shading in a plan view for us to agree with them that it is not impermeable pavement they are installing.

Doug Howie
Dept. of Ecology
(360) 407-6444 (voice)
douglas.howie@ecy.wa.gov

From: Peterschmidt, Mark F. (ECY)
Sent: Monday, September 29, 2014 2:45 PM
To: Howie, Douglas (ECY)
Cc: Jedel, Andrea (ECY); Wittmeier, Terry (ECY)
Subject: Permeable Gravel?

Hi Doug-
I’ve just had a conversation with Terry Wittmeier about the permeability of gravel roads and thought I would bounce the question off you as well.

The question is: The common gravel road does not meet the permeability standards because the gravel breaks down and become so compacted that storm water runs off the road rather than infiltrates. Can gravel roads be built to a standard that would preserve the porosity and permeability of the gravel over the long term?

The root of this question is a set of plans for installing a boat launch ramp into the Columbia River in Douglas County. The plans (relevant pages attached) show the access road and parking area are “Permeable Gravel Surfacing”. If the
permeability of the gravel surfacing cannot be maintained there is a need for stormwater run off controls to prevent discharge to the Columbia River.

Thanks,
Mark Peterschmidt
(509) 454-7843
Hi Curtis,

Thank you for sending additional information pertaining to the Grant County PUD Apricot Orchards Boat Launch project for review and comment. I have a couple of comments from my review, listed below. Ecology’s water quality program has also reviewed the drawings and may have some additional comments pertaining to permeability of the proposed gravel surfacing. When they are available, I will forward them along to you.

Shoreline and Environmental Assistance Program comments on Apricot Orchards Boat Launch Improvements:

1. The project proponent states that the project includes work on currently degraded, unvegetated land primarily in use for parking and is not included in the calculation of impact area for purposes of identifying mitigation requirements. Douglas County SMP Appendix H, Chapter 2 requires mitigation of wetland buffers at 1:1 for non-native disturbance and 2:1 for native disturbance. Ecology recommends the project proponent provide mitigation areas for areas disturbed in accordance to Douglas County’s SMP. Ecology does not recommend granting credit, and not providing mitigation for, existing unpermitted disturbance in wetland buffers.

2. Identify ownership and access rights to the proposed off-site mitigation area. Ecology recommends placement of the off-site mitigation area in a conservation easement, deed restriction, or similar recorded notice with the County’s assessor.

Please call if you have any questions or concerns. Thank you,

Andrea

Andrea Jedel, PWS
Department of Ecology | Shorelands & Environmental Assistance Program | (509) 454-4260 | ajed461@ecy.wa.gov
August 4, 2014

Public Utility District No. 2 of Grant County
c/o Debbie Knaub
PO Box 878
Ephrata, WA 98823

RE: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Reference # NWS-2013-1080
Nationwide Permit #3 for Apricot Orchards Boat Launch Improvement Project,
Columbia River, near Quincy, Douglas County, Washington

Dear Ms. Knaub:

The Department of Ecology (Ecology) has received the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers’ letter dated February 14, 2014, approving coverage under Nationwide Permit (NWP) #3 for the above project.

Upon review of the JARPA received October 14, 2013, Ecology has determined that the project meets the requirements for Washington State 401 Water Quality Certification under NWP #3. Therefore, an Individual 401 certification will not be required for this project and you may proceed as directed by the Corps.

Any changes to your project that would impact water quality should be submitted in writing to Ecology before work begins for additional review.

This letter does not exempt you from other requirements of federal, state, and local agencies.

Please contact me if you have any questions regarding this letter at (509) 454-4260 or e-mail ajed461@ecy.wa.gov.

Sincerely,

Andrea Jedel, PWS
Federal Permit Manager
Shorelands and Environmental Assistance Program

cc: ecyrefedpermits@ecy.wa.gov
Tim Erkel, USACE
Erie Pentico, WDFW
Curtis Lilquist, Douglas County
Curtis Lillquist (x6588)

From: Pentico, Eric D (DFW) <Eric.Pentico@dfw.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 11:21 AM
To: Curtis Lillquist (x6588)
Subject: RE: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch resubmitted info

Curtis,

I’m assuming you are referring to the comment I provided last January about including shrub and forb species in the upland seed mix or shrub plugs. The presence of cultural resources at the Columbia Siding site restricts significant ground disturbing activities (planting of shrub plugs) but does not adequately explain why forb and shrub seeds cannot be included in the broadcast seed mix, especially if supplemental irrigation water will be provided as necessary. The comment/question I provided still seem to be relevant.

Eric

Eric Pentico
Region 2 Area Habitat Biologist
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

From: clillquist@co.douglas.wa.us [mailto:clillquist@co.douglas.wa.us]
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 8:50 AM
To: Pentico, Eric D (DFW)
Subject: RE: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch resubmitted info

Try Sect 5.1 of the F&W HMMP.

Curtis

From: Pentico, Eric D (DFW) <Eric.Pentico@dfw.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 8:48 AM
To: Curtis Lillquist (x6588)
Subject: RE: Apricot Orchards Boat Launch resubmitted info

Curtis,

As I was going through one of the several documents that were sent, I recall seeing some reasoning GCPUD had for not including shrub plugs or seeds with the native grasses, but I can’t re-locate that. Could you please refresh my memory or let me know where it is so I can re-read? Thanks.

Eric

Eric Pentico
Region 2 Area Habitat Biologist
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Good Morning Eric,

Back on September 10th I sent you Grant County PUD’s responses to comments/request for additional info for their Apricot Orchards Boat Launch project. Have you had a chance to review that info? If so, will you be changing your original comments?

Thanks!

Curtis Lillquist, A.I.C.P.
Principal Planner – Development Services

Douglas County Transportation and Land Services
140 19th St. NW
East Wenatchee WA 98801
(509) 884-7173
cilquist@co.douglas.wa.us
Curtis Lillquist (x6588)

From: Pentico, Eric D (DFW) <Eric.Pentico@dfw.wa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, January 14, 2014 1:19 PM
To: Curtis Lillquist (x6588)
Subject: Apricot Orchard

Curtis,

I have been reading through the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Management and Mitigation Plan submitted by GCPUD for the Apricot Orchard project. It states that for impacts to the 7,950 square ft. of shrub-steppe habitat, approximately 23,850 square ft. of upland will be re-seeded with native grasses. However, relying on natural regeneration, there is no commitment by GCPUD to replace any loses to big sage-brush, rabbit brush, and other forbs caused by the disturbance activity. Natural reestablishment of vegetation in an upland, semi-desert environment is slow and hazardous at best, generally requiring ideal conditions over a period of several years to occur. I respectfully encourage Douglas Co. require the inclusion of shrub and forb seeds in the reseeding effort at the very least in the conditions of the shoreline permit. Ideally, shrub plugs should be required to enhance the chances of success.

Thank you,

Eric

Eric Pentico
Region 2 Area Habitat Biologist
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Application materials do not include sufficient information with regard to provisions for access.

Right-of-way for Spanish Castle Road south of the BNSF Railway needs to be clearly identified. There are two alignments graphically indicated on the County's parcel map, although information associated with perfection of these alignments needs to be investigated to ascertain the status of each right-of-way.

The Spanish Castle Road alignment is mostly located within the boundary of the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort. The sub-area comprehensive plan associated with the Master Planned Resort is the applicable document with regards to development standards associated with circulation and development (road) standards applicable to Spanish Castle Road.

The Spanish Castle Road crossing of the BNSF Railway is an unperfected easement. BNSR Railway noted that until such time as the easement crossing BNSF is perfected AND safety improvements at the crossing have been completed, that BNSF does not support approval of additional development or activities which would encourage additional traffic to utilize the Spanish Castle Road crossing of BNSF.

The Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort proponent has been working with Douglas County (and the County with BNSF) to address perfection of the easement and coordination of design and ultimately construction of BNSF required safety improvements at the crossing. Initially this included improvements at the location of the existing at-grade crossing. Currently the potential of realignment of Spanish Castle Road and construction of an overpass of the BNSF Railway is being investigated.

County staff has encouraged Grant County PUD representatives to engage the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort proponents in discussions to address the desire to cross BNSF Railway in a cooperative manner. This is still a recommendation that the County encourages the Grant County PUD to pursue.

In addition to needing to address transportation improvements within the application materials (and as part of the project improvements), provisions to address stormwater runoff associated with said improvements shall be included.

On-site stormwater shall be addressed in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations including but not limited to Douglas County Code 20.34, 20.36, the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program (administered by Douglas County Land Services) and the Ecology General Stormwater Permit with respect to discharges to Waters of the State, which is administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.
Existing at-grade crossing, requires improvement PRIOR to approval of any permit that would require crossing of BNSF facility.

Potential location of REVISED location of grade separation crossing of BNSF facility.

Need documentation of legal access to the site. County records regarding these alignments indicates perfection of these alignments may be necessary to facilitate access.

Given the primitive nature of the "road", the issues associated with perfecting access across BNSF property, including safety improvements and the potential relocation of the crossing. It is recommended that Apricot Orchards and Columbia River Investors coordinate efforts with regard to the Spanish Castle alignment. Note: The Columbia River Investors properties are part of a Master Planned Resort Development. Road Standards contained within the sub-area plan for the Master Planned resort are applicable within the MPR boundary.
DOUGLAS COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND SERVICES

MEMO

To:        Curtis Lillquist
CC:        Douglas Bramlette, PE, Todd Wilson
From:      Jennifer Lange
Date:      March 4, 2014
Re:        SP-13-14 – Grant PUD – Apricot Orchards Boat Launch – updated Transportation comments

On February 25, 2014 staff discussed with the Board of County Commissioners the Shoreline Permit application submitted by the Grant County PUD. Grant County PUD representative Igor Shaporda, Lands Specialist attended the meeting to provide information as needed.

Staff discussed the two rights of ways extending beyond the current BNSF Railways Crossing. Staff’s position is that there are currently two rights-of-ways – by use, one of which has been utilized by the public to access the existing Grant County PUD primitive boat launch.

A summary of the discussion and action taken at the Board of County Commissioner meeting is provided below:

Igor Shaporda, Lands Specialist with Grant County PUD joined session to discuss their shoreline permit. Curtis Lillquist, Senior Planner provided summary of the shoreline permit the PUD has applied for. The road to the boat launch is proposed to remain primitive. The launch will be improved with a boat ramp to launch boats. There will be 10 parking sites. There was also discussion of the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort. The county at this time is supportive of an underpass for the railway crossing. The overpass for the developer is out due to the cost. The underpass would help with some the noise and liability issues. There was question about perfecting the road from the current to the new location if an underpass was done. Mr. Shaporda was uncomfortable with committing to any type of assistance with the new road without approval by his Board, but would be willing to present it to the PUD. Mr. Shaporda reiterated that Spanish Castle Master Plan Resort should be a self-sustained project. There was also question about the emergency access, which staff and the PUD will need to clarify. Jennifer stated that the Burlington Northern Railroad has concern about construction vehicles using the current crossing. Commissioner Snyder upon return will contact Spanish Castle representatives in regards to an underpass. Jennifer will work on and update of the conditions associated with approving the Grant PUD shoreline permit.
Commissioner Jenkins moved to authorize Grant County PUD’s shoreline permit #13-14 conditional approval of the permit upon Grant County PUD preparation of a signage plan, which addresses the following including but not limited to: primitive nature of roads; width of road; steepness of road; limitations associated with use of the launch. Grant PUD would be responsible for cost of signs and installation. The Board of Commissioners indicated that the shoreline permit would not be subject to making safety improvements to the BNSF railroad crossing. Commissioner Stanton second and concurred.

Approval of the Shoreline Permit is recommended with the following conditions:

1. Grant County PUD shall prepare and submit an engineered signage plan, prepared in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Devices to address access to the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch. The plan shall address the following including but not limited to: the primitive nature of the road, road width, road grade, side slopes and any limitations on vehicular access and use of the boat launch. A separate temporary signage plan shall accommodate construction activities. The plan shall be submitted and approved PRIOR to construction commencing.

2. Temporary construction signage shall be approved and signs in place PRIOR to construction commencing.

3. The Grant County PUD shall be responsible for the cost of signage (temporary and permanent) including initial installation, as well as reconfiguration replacement as necessary.

4. The County Fire Marshal may upon evaluation of the application require measures to address pullouts to facilitate passage of two vehicles along the proposed access route. Improvements required if any shall be the responsibility of the Grant County PUD and shall reviewed, permitted, constructed and accepted by the County Engineer as outlined in Title 12, Douglas County Code.

5. An engineered stormwater plan and report shall be submitted in accordance with Douglas County Code 20.34 & 20.36. On-site stormwater shall be addressed in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations including but not limited to Douglas County Code 20.34, 20.36, the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program (administered by Douglas County Land Services) and the Ecology General Stormwater Permit with respect to discharges to Waters of the State, which is administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.
The following information was received by the Transportation Department on March 30, 2015:

- Stormwater Analysis (SCJ Alliance) noted as revised December, prepared 12/31/14. Stormwater Analysis includes sheets S-01: SIGN PLAN, and L-502 (untitled — appears to be signage details).
- Updated Signage Plan (Attachment 4)
- An 8x11 plan sheet set (15 pages), plus an Aerial Vicinity Map.
- Pages 8 and 9 of 9 of the AOLB Additional Information Response from Grant PUD Lands Specialist.

The current submittal has been reviewed for conformance with Douglas County Code and the comments/recommendations that were outlined in a March 4, 2014 Memorandum prepared after a February 25, 2014 meeting with the Board of County Commissioners, Grant PUD representatives and staff.

Approval of the Shoreline Permit is recommended with the following conditions:

1. Grant County PUD shall prepare and submit an engineered signage plan, prepared in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Devices to address access to the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch. The plan shall address the following including but not limited to: the primitive nature of the road, road width, road grade, side slopes and any limitations on vehicular access and use of the boat launch. A separate temporary signage plan shall accommodate construction activities. The engineered signage plan shall be provided/accepted PRIOR TO HEARING, and implemented prior to construction. Cost of signage shall be borne by the Grant County PUD. A minimum of 30 days notice of construction commencing shall be provided to the County Engineer such that signage installation may be initiated to accommodate construction and use of the proposed improvements.

Two portions of the March 2015 submittal reference signage. Sheet S-01 (Sign Plan) and L-502 (Sign Details?) were included/attached to the Stormwater Analysis dated December 2014. Please confirm the preparation dates of this analysis.

During the February 25, 2014 meeting between the applicant (Grant County PUD), staff and the Board of County Commissioners, the Grant County PUD requested relief from road improvements to Spanish Castle Road, which is a primitive road. The Board granted relief from road improvements, subject to the condition noted...
above, which indicated that the Grant County PUD was to prepare an engineered signage plan for the private road sections to be utilized, paying particular attention to providing notification to users PRIOR to the BNSF at-grade crossing. The plan submitted has not been prepared by a licensed engineer and primarily addresses signage for the Grant County PUD property improvements. The proposed sign locations at near the intersection of SR 28 and Spanish Castle Road are not sufficient to address the items noted above. As previously discussed section of Spanish Castle Road, above the BNSF crossing are pending construction of improvements. At this time construction plans have been approved for a portion of the Spanish Castle Road corridor. A portion of this plan set is provided for your reference and use in development of a complete signage plan.

Attachment 4 (Updated Signage Plan, includes only sheet L 503, and does not supplement the information discussed above.

2. Temporary construction signage shall be approved PRIOR TO HEARING and signs in place PRIOR to construction commencing. No information addressing this condition has been provided.

3. The Grant County PUD shall be responsible for the cost of signage (temporary and permanent) including initial installation, as well as reconfiguration replacement as necessary. Upon acceptance of a signage plan, the applicant shall coordinate with Douglas County with regards to signage installation. Temporary construction signage shall be placed by the Grant County PUD (or their designee contractor). Permanent signage shall be installed by Douglas County. Grant County PUD will be invoiced for the associated cost of labor and materials for permanent signage installation.

4. The County Fire Marshal may upon evaluation of the application require measures to address pullouts to facilitate passage of two vehicles along the proposed access route. Improvements required if any shall be the responsibility of the Grant County PUD and shall reviewed, permitted, constructed and accepted by the County Engineer as outlined in Title 12, Douglas County Code. The applicant is responsible for coordination with the Douglas County Fire Marshal to satisfy this condition.

5. An engineered stormwater plan and report has been submitted in accordance with Douglas County Code 20.34 & 20.36. On-site stormwater shall be addressed in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations including but not limited to Douglas County Code 20.34, 20.36, the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program (administered by Douglas County Land Services) and the Ecology General Stormwater Permit with respect to discharges to Waters of the State, which is administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology. Acquisition of applicable local, state and/or federal permits is the responsibility of the Grant County PUD.

Note: The submitted report states that Core Elements 1-5, 7 and 8 apply. The report addresses/discusses Core Elements 5, 6, and 8

As noted above and within previous correspondence the site improvements do not discharge to the County stormwater system. Compliance with the Douglas County
Shoreline Master Program is administered by the Land Services Department. Discharges to the Columbia River and compliance with Ecology's General Construction Stormwater Permit are regulated by the Washington State Department of Ecology. Compliance is the responsibility of the applicant.

The status of coordination by the Grant PUD with the Washington State Department of Ecology with regard to proximity to and discharge to the Columbia River is unknown.

The plan sheet does show the location of the proposed boat ramp as being located within County right-of-way. An exhibit — attached... provides recommendations with respect to addressing the conflict with County right-of-way and the proposal to construct Grand County PUD improvements. PRIOR TO HEARING, contact Todd Wilson and/or Jennifer Lange for additional information or to initiate the vacation process, this is a minimum of a two week process. Proposed construction of Grant PUD facilities within County right-of-way shall be addressed PRIOR TO HEARING.

STATUS: The Vacation noted above is scheduled for Public Hearing before the Board of County Commissioners (TLS 15-19A) on Tuesday April 7, 2015 at 10:30 am.
DOUGLAS COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND SERVICES

MEMO

To: Curtis Lillquist
CC: Douglas Bramlette, PE PLS, Todd Wilson PLS, Cheri Peterson, PE
From: Jennifer Lange, PE
Date: October 1, 2014 – (October 6, 2014 – timing clarification)
Re: SP-13-14, CUP 13-02– Apricot Orchards Boat Launch – Trans. & SW comments

The current submittal has been reviewed for conformance with Douglas County Code and the comments/recommendations that were outlined in a March 4, 2014 Memorandum prepared after a February 25, 2014 meeting with the Board of County Commissioners, Grant PUD representatives and staff. The previous memo is attached for your reference.

________________________

Approval of the Shoreline Permit is recommended with the following conditions:

1. Grant County PUD shall prepare and submit an engineered signage plan, prepared in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Devices to address access to the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch. The plan shall address the following including but not limited to: the primitive nature of the road, road width, road grade, side slopes and any limitations on vehicular access and use of the boat launch. A separate temporary signage plan shall accommodate construction activities. The engineered signage plan shall be provided/accepted PRIOR TO HEARING, and implemented prior to construction. Cost of signage shall be borne by the Grant County PUD. A minimum of 30 days notice of construction commencing shall be provided to the County Engineer such that signage installation may be initiated to accommodate construction and use of the proposed improvements.

2. Temporary construction signage shall be approved PRIOR TO HEARING and signs in place PRIOR to construction commencing.

3. The Grant County PUD shall be responsible for the cost of signage (temporary and permanent) including initial installation, as well as reconfiguration replacement as necessary.

4. The County Fire Marshal may upon evaluation of the application require measures to address pullouts to facilitate passage of two vehicles along the proposed access route. Improvements required if any shall be the responsibility of the Grant County PUD and shall reviewed, permitted, constructed and accepted by the County Engineer as outlined in Title 12, Douglas County Code.

5. An engineered stormwater plan and report has been submitted in accordance with Douglas County Code 20.34 & 20.36. On-site stormwater shall be addressed in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations including but not
limited to Douglas County Code 20.34, 20.36, the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program (administered by Douglas County Land Services) and the Ecology General Stormwater Permit with respect to discharges to Waters of the State, which is administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology. Acquisition of applicable local, state and/or federal permits is the responsibility of the Grant County PUD.

Conditions 1, 2, and 3 were not addressed in the updated application materials.

The status of Condition 4, coordination with the Douglas County Fire Marshal is unknown.

A stormwater plan/report has been provided. Comments are included as mark-ups within the report, which is attached for reference. The status of coordination by the Grant PUD with the Washington State Department of Ecology with regard to proximity to and discharge to the Columbia River is unknown. As noted within the comments on the report, review for compliance with the County Shoreline Master Program is administered by the Land Services Department.

The plan sheet does show the location of the proposed boat ramp as being located within County right-of-way. An exhibit – attached... provides recommendations with respect to addressing the conflict with County right-of-way and the proposal to construct Grand County PUD improvements. PRIOR TO HEARING, contact Todd Wilson and/or Jennifer Lange for additional information or to initiate the vacation process, this is a minimum of a two week process. Proposed construction of Grant PUD facilities within County right-of-way, shall be addressed PRIOR TO HEARING.
DOUGLAS COUNTY
TRANSPORTATION AND LAND SERVICES

MEMO

To: Curtis Lillquist
CC: Douglas Bramlette, PE, Todd Wilson
From: Jennifer Lange
Date: March 4, 2014
Re: SP-13-14 – Grant PUD – Apricot Orchards Boat Launch – updated Transportation comments

On February 25, 2014 staff discussed with the Board of County Commissioners the Shoreline Permit application submitted by the Grant County PUD. Grant County PUD representative Igor Shaporda, Lands Specialist attended the meeting to provide information as needed.

Staff discussed the two rights of ways extending beyond the current BNSF Railways Crossing. Staff’s position is that there are currently two rights-of-ways – by use, one of which has been utilized by the public to access the existing Grant County PUD primitive boat launch.

A summary of the discussion and action taken at the Board of County Commissioner meeting is provided below:

Igor Shaporda, Lands Specialist with Grant County PUD joined session to discuss their shoreline permit. Curtis Lillquist, Senior Planner provided summary of the shoreline permit the PUD has applied for. The road to the boat launch is proposed to remain primitive. The launch will be improved with a boat ramp to launch boats. There will be 10 parking sites. There was also discussion of the Spanish Castle Master Planned Resort. The county at this time is supportive of an underpass for the railway crossing. The overpass for the developer is out due to the cost. The underpass would help with some the noise and liability issues. There was question about perfecting the road from the current to the new location if an underpass was done. Mr. Shaporda was uncomfortable with committing to any type of assistance with the new road without approval by his Board, but would be willing to present it to the PUD. Mr. Shaporda reiterated that Spanish Castle Master Plan Resort should be a self-sustained project. There was also question about the emergency access, which staff and the PUD will need to clarify. Jennifer stated that the Burlington Northern Railroad has concern about construction vehicles using the current crossing. Commissioner Snyder upon return will contact Spanish Castle representatives in regards to an underpass. Jennifer will work on and update of the conditions associated with approving the Grant PUD shoreline permit.
Commissioner Jenkins moved to authorize Grant County PUD's shoreline permit #13-14 conditional approval of the permit upon Grant County PUD preparation of a signage plan, which addresses the following including but not limited to: primitive nature of roads; width of road; steepness of road; limitations associated with use of the launch. Grant PUD would be responsible for cost of signs and installation. The Board of Commissioners indicated that the shoreline permit would not be subject to making safety improvements to the BNSF railroad crossing. Commissioner Stanton second and concurred.

Approval of the Shoreline Permit is recommended with the following conditions:

1. Grant County PUD shall prepare and submit an engineered signage plan, prepared in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Devices to address access to the Apricot Orchards Boat Launch. The plan shall address the following including but not limited to: the primitive nature of the road, road width, road grade, side slopes and any limitations on vehicular access and use of the boat launch. A separate temporary signage plan shall accommodate construction activities. The plan shall be submitted and approved PRIOR to construction commencing.

2. Temporary construction signage shall be approved and signs in place PRIOR to construction commencing.

3. The Grant County PUD shall be responsible for the cost of signage (temporary and permanent) including initial installation, as well as reconfiguration replacement as necessary.

4. The County Fire Marshal may upon evaluation of the application require measures to address pullouts to facilitate passage of two vehicles along the proposed access route. Improvements required if any shall be the responsibility of the Grant County PUD and shall reviewed, permitted, constructed and accepted by the County Engineer as outlined in Title 12, Douglas County Code.

5. An engineered stormwater plan and report shall be submitted in accordance with Douglas County Code 20.34 & 20.36. On-site stormwater shall be addressed in accordance with applicable local, state and federal regulations including but not limited to Douglas County Code 20.34, 20.36, the Douglas County Shoreline Master Program (administered by Douglas County Land Services) and the Ecology General Stormwater Permit with respect to discharges to Waters of the State, which is administered by the Washington State Department of Ecology.
Approximate location of boat ramp improvements - proposed location within County ROW

Recommend Grant PUD - request that previous agreement (unfulfilled) for ROW vacation in lieu of bypass be recinded

Follow with petition to vacate County ROW at the location noted below:

Vacation would be conditioned upon two items.
1) Deeding Grant PUD owned property in the previously noted bypass alignment
2) Dedication and construction of a turnaround at the end of the SCR ROW. This will clearly delineate Grant PUD improvement and County ROW

Please contact Todd Wilson and/or Jennifer Lange for additional information/clarification as needed and to initiate the vacation process.

Source: Esri, DigitalGlobe, GeoEye, i-cubed, USDA, USGS, AEX, Getmapping, Aerocid, IGN, IGP, swisstopo, and the GIS User Community
It likely does change the status of the vacation comments... that being said, I don’t think an update of the comments is necessary. The proponent should be aware of the status of the vacation.

The applicant requested a status of the application as of that date, and that is what was provided.

Please advise if you need an update. I have not received a copy of the Vacation action from the BOCC at this time... so I will need that in order to process and update and reference the official action.

Jennifer

Based the outcome of the vacation hearing yesterday, do you need to update your April 3rd comments?

Curtis Lillquist, A.I.C.P.
Principal Planner – Development Services

Douglas County Transportation and Land Services
140 19th St. NW
East Wenatchee WA 98801
(509) 884-7173
cillquist@co.douglas.wa.us