



462651014000-226-010-SIMONSON-20120314

March 14, 2012

colinm@sanjuanco.com
San Juan County Council Members

RE: Shoreline Inventory and characterization Report.

Dear Colin and Council Members :

Thank you for your help regarding the confirmation that my property is located with in the Roche Harbor area and reach 226. As I understand it, Reach 226 is from the head of Garrison Creek over to Horseshoe Bay, all in Garrison Bay. I am located on lot 14 of the First Addition to Yacht Haven Tax parcel number 462651014.

I have reviewed the report and disagree that eelgrass presence should be rated a 5 within the entire reach 226. Back in the mid 1980s two docks were built in the immediate area and my shared dock was constructed in 1992. Several repair permits have been processed after year 2000. As part of the permit process back then we were all required to provide an eelgrass study and docks could not be constructed over an eelgrass bed. Those reports indicated no eelgrass and our docks were approved. There is no eelgrass located in the high tide area out past Gus Island in Garrison Bay and there hasn't been any since mid 1980 as evidenced by the fact that permits were granted for docks. Further, at an extreme low tide such as minus 3, you can walk from the beaches to Gus Island and there is no eelgrass along the way, it is all mud. I do know that there is eelgrass out in the middle of the bay where the boats anchor and the water depth is around 20 feet. If I understand properly, this report doesn't address that area as it is considered State Waters and therefore the presence of eelgrass in the middle of the bay is not part of this inventory report. I have attached photographs of the beaches from Garrison Creek over to the Horseshoe Bay at the lowest tide available before the deadline. Please note, no eelgrass, just mud for the entire neighborhood until the rocky shoreline starts near the corner of Horseshoe Bay.

I read the comment in the report that the lack of eelgrass is caused by docks and over the water structures, which I do not agree with as there was no eelgrass when those over water structures were built. Further, I sure wish the County would acknowledge the threat to eelgrass by the local Canadian Geese. Since before I can remember, we have had a population of Canadian Geese that no longer migrate. They nest on Gus Island and their population has increased to more than 80 and greater in the summer after the hatching. They eat the eelgrass as I have seen them on a regular basis pulling up the grass that is over by Bell Point. They have also driven off the Heron and other sea birds that use to enjoy the quiet, peacefulness of Garrison Bay. The Geese come onto the shore in large groups and lay in the mud during the day. They are poop and quacking machines; they drive off other birds and deposit high levels of fecal matter along the beaches. One of the restoration projects in the reach should be to relocate the Canadian Geese. If this could be done, I believe that the native sea bird activity along the reach's shoreline would return as well as the eelgrass and small fish. The Inventory report should mention the lack of eelgrass is also due to the geese population and that they are one of the largest

sources of fecal matter in the Bay and the stream that discharges into the Bay. A totally different population of Geese surrounds the ponds that run into Garrison Creek as we drive by them daily.

I do not want the designation of a level 5 for eelgrass to come back and haunt me or any of my neighbors in the reach. I have a concern that if anyone applies for a development permit, they will be given grief. Your records will show, although incorrect, that we had eelgrass in March 2012 and during the future permit process they will discover, we have no eelgrass so a permit may be denied or heavily conditioned.. All of our homes will be blamed for the loss of eelgrass from March 2012 onward which will not be correct.

I further disagree with the entire neighborhood being under a wetland designation. We have some drainage throughout the neighborhood but I don't believe the entire area would be considered a wetland. I am not able to afford a wetland delineation report at this time to prove your inventory report wrong so I will wait until it is needed for some purpose in the future which is an unfair burden to place on me as a property owner.

As this report is the baseline for "no net loss" in the future, I believe it is important to go on record with my opinion and regular personal observations and those of my neighbors in reach 226. Eelgrass in reach 226 should be 0.

Thank you for your retaining this letter in your files.

Merri Ann Simonson
290 Heron Lane
Friday Harbor WA 98250

























