

## Colin Maycock

---

**From:** Jeffrey Otis <jeffo@rockisland.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, January 07, 2019 3:25 PM  
**To:** Colin Maycock  
**Cc:** David-Lila Dickhaus  
**Subject:** Re: PSJ000-18-0003 Feasible alternatives  
**Attachments:** JU agreement rev 1.4.19 draft.pdf

Colin,

A ramp would not be a feasible alternative as the bank is approximately 15' - 20' high. A ramp would be too steep for vehicles to maneuver between the top of the bank and the shoreline. Additionally, it would not resolve the impacts associated with dragging multiple dinghies over the tidelands, potentially impacting marine habits. Lastly, a ramp serving six lots would require an adequately sized parking lot and maneuvering area capable of staging vehicles and boats on the Appleton and Dickhaus properties. Even if there was adequate room to accommodate such a massive facility, which there isn't, this would require substantial grading, tree removal, and increases in impervious surface, all of which would impact habitat values associated with shoreline.

The intent of the proposal is to create a boating facility that can provide moorage for all of the lots in the Westcott Shores Plats. To adequately meet this purpose we believe the best approach is a combination of a fixed pier and float and use of existing buoys. By using a combination of float and buoys, we're able to reduce the overall size of the dock and provide limited long-term moorage at the dock and a facility for loading and unloading of equipment and people from vessels. To reduce potential impacts of the proposed dock, the applicants voluntarily revised the originally submitted proposal by reducing the float 20' from 80' to 60'. In order to accommodate all six lot owners, the three existing buoys must be retained and used in conjunction with moorage at the float. In doing so, the dock size is able to remain smaller than it would otherwise. Reducing the float size further is not reasonable or feasible given the number of lots this one dock will serve. Boating facilities such as this proposals which use a combination of buoys and fixed pier and floats are listed as a higher priority in the Shoreline Master Program than any other privately owned fixed pier facility.

Even if the float size was reduced, there would still need to be enough float space to provide for periodic moorage of one or more powerboats or sailboats for loading and unloading of people and equipment. The depth of the proposed dock would need to be retained as would the overall length of the pier and ramp. A minor reduction in float size would accomplish a minor reduction in shading of the the substrate, however the reduction would not result in a substantial benefit to the marine environment as the float does not shade any marine vegetation. Normally, a dinghy dock would be proposed in order to reduce potential impacts to the marine environment. That would not be the case here. This proposal already substantially protects the marine environment by being the only dock to serve six lots over approximately 800 lineal feet of shoreline, and by reducing the footprint of the facility by employing mooring buoys in conjunction with the fixed pier and float.

I've also attached the revised JU agreement that limits the number of pleasure boats to four per DNR regulations and indicates that the current or future owners of the Wood Family Trust lot have a right to use the proposed dock as an option user or owner subject to revision of the agreement. Changes are noted in red.

Hope this helps.

Jeff Otis

On Jan 7, 2019, at 9:05 AM, Colin Maycock <[Colinm@sanjuanco.com](mailto:Colinm@sanjuanco.com)> wrote:

Hi Jeff,

Is there a reason that a dinghy dock or ramp would not work in this location?

The applicants have mooring buoys so it seems a smaller dock would suffice.

Colin

Colin Maycock, AICP  
Planner IV  
San Juan County,  
Department of Community Development  
Direct line: 360-370-7573  
[colinm@sanjuanco.com](mailto:colinm@sanjuanco.com)

NOTICE: All emails, and attachments, sent to and from San Juan County are public records and may be subject to disclosure pursuant to the Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW.