



KITSAP COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

614 DIVISION STREET MS-36, PORT ORCHARD WASHINGTON 98366-4682
(360) 337-7181 FAX (360) 337-4925 HOME PAGE - www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/

M E M O R A N D U M

Date: May 14, 2009

To: Charlotte Garrido, Chair
Steve Bauer, Commissioner
Josh Brown, Commissioner
Nancy Buonanno-Grennen, Administrator

Cc: Larry Keeton, DCD Director
Jeffrey Rowe-Hornbaker, Assistant Director, DCD
Eric Baker, Special Projects Manager, Commissioners Office
Scott Diener, Policy and Planning Manager, DCD
Shelley Kneip, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney
Cindy Read, Senior GIS Analyst, DCD
Dennis Oost, Senior Planner, DCD

From: Katrina N. Knutson, Senior Planner, DCD

Subj: Summary of 5/13/09 RWIP Work-Study

Board of County Commissioner's Guiding Values for RWIP:

- 1) **Fiscal Responsibility and Sustainability**
- 2) **Inter-jurisdictional Coordination**
- 3) **Economy, Environment, Community**
- 4) **Preservation of Rural Character**
- 5) **Compliance with the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA)**
- 6) **Open Space**

Board of County Commissioner's Vision for Kitsap County:

Along with the Kitsap County Vision Statement, the Board stated they would like Kitsap County to be known for vibrant, healthy waterfront cities with a strong rural character.

Questions-Forest:

- 1) Is a 100 year old Douglas Fir more beneficial to the environment than a 50 year old Fir?

- 2) What is the County's ability to affect timber management practices in "open space", i.e., could the County specify selective logging vs. clear cuts?
- 3) How significant is forestry to the Kitsap County economy? The binder indicates that there are only 20+ forestry related permanent jobs in the County. The comprehensive plan does not designate any commercially viable forest lands in the County.
- 4) How does a one-time infusion of funds for the property owner allow them to maintain active forestry if forestry is not economically viable?
- 5) Is preservation of a mature forest more important and beneficial than on-going forestry resulting in less mature forests?
- 6) What are the criteria in determining if land is prime for forestry?
- 7) What criteria were used when designating current Forest Resource Lands in Kitsap County?

Questions-Wildlife/Environment:

- 1) Given the fact that the majority of 20 acre parcels are largely left in forest use, how significant a difference is there on wildlife/aquifer recharge/groundwater/stormwater from 20 acre parcels compared to larger tracts?
- 2) What are the impacts of these rural subdivisions on aquifer recharge compared to 20 acre home sites?
- 3) Are we better off with 20 acre home sites?

Questions-Fiscal:

- 1) What are the public service costs associated with an 800 lot subdivision adjacent to Port Gamble compared to the revenues generated. Include transit, fire service, school district costs, law enforcement, transportation and others as appropriate. Would the governmental units prefer to service that population at Port Gamble or in existing cities and urban growth areas.
- 2) How does a one-time infusion of funds for the property owner allow them to maintain active forestry if forestry is not economically viable?
- 3) How do we provide local government services to the rural areas under a constrained County budget? To what degree would urban areas be subsidizing clusters?
- 4) How do we connect large clusters to roads that we can not afford?

5) What are the incremental costs associated with the density increase proposed by RWIP?

Questions-Growth Management:

- 1) What are the historical rural businesses in Kitsap County?
- 2) What are the historical rural uses in Kitsap County?
- 3) What would be the impact adding 8,000 additional homes to those already permitted under current zoning and previously vested on the urban/rural population targets adopted in the County Planning Policies?
- 4) The County apparently did some polling or community meeting/polling affecting this topic in 2000. What would it cost to update that effort now?
- 5) Should RWIP have a different set of criteria for different areas of the County?
- 6) What are the benefits and downsides of clustering?
- 7) Are there other jurisdictions that have a thriving rural clustering program? What do their evaluations show?
- 8) What would RWIP at full build-out look like?

Questions-Trails:

- 1) OPG has said that it intends to get out of Kitsap County. What happens when OPG sells to another owner who may not share OPG values and commitments?
- 2) Where would funding for maintenance of a trail system come from?
- 3) Are there other alternatives to achieving public access/trails?
- 4) The North Kitsap Trails Association has suggested creating a Metropolitan Parks District to fund trail maintenance. Could an MPD be created to purchase trail easements as well as maintain trails?
- 5) Given the popularity of trails, should Kitsap County consider a bond measure to fund trail acquisition?
- 6) What if the "Open Space" were turned over to a non-profit trails group for stewardship? Similar organizations apparently exist on the East Coast for preservation of timber lands and the option is under consideration in Washington as well. Could this group raise enough from selective logging to support trail and

forest management? Explore other success stories.

DCD Staff Responsibilities:

- 1) Provide recommendation regarding the current moratorium.**
- 2) Provide a comparison of the 20-acre parcels vs clustering. Clustering has benefits, are there any drawbacks?**
- 3) Provide any available fiscal information.**
- 4) Provide forestry/wildlife information.**