



KITSAP COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

614 DIVISION STREET MS-36, PORT ORCHARD WASHINGTON 98366-4682
(360) 337-7181 FAX (360) 337-4662 HOME PAGE - www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/

Larry Keeton, Director

Keyport Community Planning Process Community Stakeholder Group Kickoff Meeting: M I N U T E S

Tuesday, February 27, 2007, 7:00 – 8:30 p.m.

Location: Keyport Bible Church, 15270 Washington Ave. NE, Keyport, WA

Meeting Facilitators: Milt Meeds, Keyport Improvement Group
& James Weaver, Kitsap County Department of Community Development (DCD)

Meeting Attendance (from sign-up sheet): Bob & Jo Ballard, Paul Berg, Deborah DuBois, Doug Jennings, Gary Kohler, Ray Newell, Evonne Posten, Warren Posten, Andrew Sheridan, Karol Stevens, Rhonda Williamson, Denny Johnson, Linda Dudzic, Alfon McFadden (spelling?), Rich Culley, Milt Meeds, Dick & Shirl Golden, John Steinmeitz, Brian Watne, Tom Lewis, Laraine Gaulke, Doug Chamberlain, John Thompson, James Weaver (DCD), Katrina Knutson (DCD).

Agenda Item: Meeting Introduction:

Milt Meeds of the Keyport Improvement Group, began the meeting and introduced James Weaver, a Senior Planner from Kitsap County Department of Community Development and the project manager of the Keyport Community Plan. James Weaver thanked everyone for attending the meeting and then gave a brief explanation of the Community Planning effort and a recap of the previous meeting held on Feb. 13th. James briefly discussed the website and the availability of the documents and maps to be downloaded from the County website (http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/community_plan/subareas/keyport).

James Weaver then referred to the handouts that would be discussed during the agenda discussion items and ensured that everyone had received a copy of those documents. He then discussed an additional set of handouts which were applicable county-wide. The first County-wide hand out discussed was the monthly North End Update which discussed the status various Kitsap County projects throughout the northern portion of Kitsap County (Commissioner District 1).

The other County-wide hand out discussed was related to the approved Critical Area Ordinance buffer widths for small wetlands and shorelines, approved by the Board of County Commissioners on Monday, February 26, 2007. The discussion included a description of the original Critical Area Ordinance that was passed in 2004 and the subsequent appeals of that ordinance. James then discussed the appeal items that were decided by the Central Puget Sound Growth Hearings Board to have merit (specifically the small wetland and shoreline buffers) and how the Growth Board decided to remand (send back) those two items back to Kitsap County to approve new buffers that the Growth Board would find acceptable. James discussed the proposed options from the appellants, Department of Community Development staff, the Kitsap County Planning Commission, and what the Board of County Commissioners ended up approving as a compromise that may be sufficient to meet the Growth Board requirements. James also described in detail how the shoreline setbacks would affect parcels within the Keyport community and answered general questions regarding shorelines. James suggested that the Kitsap County Natural Resources Manager could be requested to discuss this issue and answer specific questions at the March 27th Keyport Community Meeting, if desired. The majority of the community group indicated that a presentation from the Department of Community Development would be helpful and James stated that he would follow up on scheduling that meeting.

Question: *Do we have any wetlands in our community? Is Dogfish Bay considered wetlands?*

Staff reply: There may be one or two small wetlands. No. It is still connected to the greater water body.

Question: *What is the timeline for requesting a shoreline variance? Who renders the decision?*

Staff reply: It is a 90-day process and considered a type III decision with public notice and a hearing. The Hearing Examiner, presently Steven Causseaux, makes those decisions.

Question: *Are the existing structures grandfathered? I am within the 100 foot buffer zone and I want to rebuild. I know I can build away from the water, but can I build closer to the water?*

Staff reply: Yes, existing structures are grandfathered. Buffers apply to new development, including expansion. You may be able to rebuild closer with a variance, but those are evaluated on a case by case basis.

Question: *What does installing new docks have to do with the setbacks? What about Bulkheads?*

Staff reply: The dock provision of the Shoreline Management Plan was not appealed. There may be an allowance for new docks, but they need to meet guidelines. Bulkhead provisions were also not appealed.

Question: *If semi-rural is changing from 35 feet to 100 feet, will a 100 feet deep shoreline lot become unbuildable?*

Staff reply: Reasonable Use and Infill provisions allow you to build. It may require an additional Habitat Management Plan, but no lot is deemed unbuildable through this resolution.

Agenda Item: LAMIRD Boundary Discussion

James Weaver then described the Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD) provision of the Washington State Growth Management Act. He then distributed a hand out with the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) pertaining to establishment of a LAMIRD and the requirements for establishing LAMIRD boundaries. He described the LAMIRD boundaries as defined by the Washington State Growth Management Act, are to include existing areas that are clearly identifiable and contained and where there is a logical boundary delineated predominately by the built environment, but that may also include undeveloped lands if limited as provided in this subsection. The county shall establish the logical outer boundary of an area of more intensive rural development.

James further explained that Kitsap County, in establishing the logical outer boundary is required to address:

- the need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities,
- the physical boundaries such as bodies of water, streets and highways, and land forms and contours,
- the prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries, and
- the ability to provide public facilities and public services in a manner that does not permit low-density sprawl;

Additionally, it was discussed that for the purposes of defining the existing area for LAMIRD boundaries, Washington State considers development in place prior to July 1, 1990 as existing development. James then described his research into the Keyport Trace development, indicating that the first recorded records he was able to find established the development in 1988, which would allow the subdivision to be included with the possible LAMIRD Boundaries, if desired by the community. It was indicated that further research would be conducted to locate the exact subdivision records for notation in the draft plan.

Further discussions included various descriptions of the existing sewer improvements; including the definition of gravity feed sewer lines, Force Main sewers, grinder pumps, and sewer pump stations, and the various sewer improvements in the Keyport Area. The Highway 308 Sewer Line was described as a Force Main that carried wastewater from Bangor, the Force Main line from Lemolo was discussed and noted that all of the waste water from Poulsbo was carried through that line, and the Brownsville Highway Force Main line was discussed and how that line collected and carried both of the other lines to be conveyed to the Brownsville wastewater Plant for processing. The gravity feed systems for both Keyport and Keyport Trace were discussed and how each has an individual pump stations that collect and sends the wastewater under high pressure into the Force Mains.

Question: *Why are we not allowed to hookup to existing sewer in the neighborhood?*

Staff reply: This question was discussed in detail at the February 13th "Kickoff" meeting. Under the Washington State Growth Management Act that was passed in 1990, a blanket rule was established by the State that no further extensions of sewer to rural properties were allowed, except in issues of immediate emergency clarified under the State law.

Question: *Does Keyport Trace have sewer hookups?*

Staff reply: There are sewer extensions to Keyport Trace. The Keyport Trace area was established prior to July 1, 1990 and consists of a limited gravity feed system that includes a small pump station that ties the wastewater system into the Brownsville Highway force main line. This system is presently sized to accommodate the existing subdivision and may possibly be able to accommodate a few more hookups, but most likely would require significant increases in capacity to be able to adequately serve the entire area south of the causeway.

Question: *Do we have grinder pumps in this area? Do we need an additional grinding unit?*

Staff reply: No, they are on individual parcels. You may need some kind of pumping system to serve the area and allow the wastewater to reach a point where it may depend upon gravity.

Question: *Please talk about Manchester grants.*

Staff reply: Manchester has received State Grants with certain requirements for age, income, and provisions for the elderly. These grants are applicable anywhere in the state and are actually a lien on the property.

Question: *If we include the Navy, can they appeal the process? Are we safer keeping them out of it?*

Staff reply: Anybody can appeal this process, even the Navy. There may be a representative present at the next meeting who can answer that question.

Question: *Will the boundaries we choose influence the State's acceptance?*

Staff reply: Yes. If we push the envelope too far, the State may remand it back to us or it may be appealed.

Question: *What are the pros and cons of including the base?*

Staff reply: Pros: If there is a possible future change to the base it may be able to revert back to community ownership. But then again, you can do your own Naval Base Reuse Plan at that time, so it may be redundant. There may be opportunities to involve and communicate with the base for coordination, funding, or joint use pedestrian elements. If they are a part, we can suggest our concerns. Cons: If we don't include them, they won't be part of our planning process. Also, they may not want to be included and may not want to participate.

Question: *If we adjust our boundaries to include existing homes in Keyport Trace not on the sewer system, will it cost more to hook up to sewer?*

Staff reply: That is a risk. Tying them in may be more costly for the overall community.

Question: *Is there any benefit to including Keyport Trace?*

Staff reply: The inclusion would allow Keyport Trace to hook up to the existing sewer infrastructure or future alternative individual membrane sewer systems. Also it may allow infill development for a few of the larger parcels adjacent to Highway 308 or Brownsville Highway.

Question: *Will improvements affect every homeowner? Are we required to install sewers or sidewalks?*

Staff reply: The majority of all the improvements would be voluntary. It may make more sense, financially, for a the community to come together and provide a unified funding opportunity, but that isn't required. Some would say that the existing charm and rural character of Keyport means there are no sidewalks. A possible solution may be to have sidewalks in all commercial areas and maintain the existing streetscape in the residential portion.

Agenda Sub-Item A: Review of Boundary Alternatives

James Weaver distributed a handout titled "LAMIRD Boundary Possible Alternative" that included maps and bullet points regarding three possible boundary alternatives. The possible LAMIRD boundary alternatives described in the handout were noted to include existing development established prior to the July 1, 1990 date, included regular boundary lines, and reflected either geographic natural features, water bodies, or historical development and public service areas as described in the State code.

The first LAMIRD boundary alternative (**Alternative 1**) was the most compact boundary, capturing the historic town limits and excluding any of the federally owned Museum or Naval Base property. The alternative boundary begun at the southwest terminus of the public right-of-way across Dogfish Bay, proceeded north across Dogfish Bay to the parcels fronting the bay, the line encircled all of the historic Keyport peninsula along the waterfront, to the northeast edge of the community and western fence line for the Naval Base. The boundary line then followed the federally owned fence line south to NE Fir Street, turned west to the State Highway 308 right-of-way and then followed the right-of-way to end at the southwest terminus of the public right-of-way across Dogfish Bay.

The second LAMIRD boundary alternative (**Alternative 2**) was identical to Alternative 1, except that all of the federally owned Museum and Naval Base property was included in the boundary limits. The alternative boundary begun at the southwest terminus of the public right-of-way across Dogfish Bay, proceeded north across Dogfish Bay to the parcels fronting the bay, the line encircled all of the historic Keyport peninsula along the waterfront, including the entire Naval Base, to the southeast, waterfront edge of the Naval Base, then following the fence line west to Brownsville Highway, turning north and following the Brownsville Highway right-of-way to end at the southwest terminus of the public right-of-way across Dogfish Bay.

The third LAMIRD boundary alternative (**Alternative 3**) was the maximum LAMIRD boundary supported by the staff research of historical development patterns. The boundary included the historic peninsula, all of the federally owned Museum and Naval Base property, and included all the parcels of the Keyport Trace subdivision within the LAMIRD boundary limits. The alternative boundary begun at the northwest edge of the Keyport Trace subdivision, near Hawk Avenue NE and Highway 308, proceeded north across Dogfish Bay to include the parcels fronting the bay, the line the encircled all of the historic Keyport peninsula along the waterfront, including the entire Naval Base, to the southeast, waterfront edge of the Naval Base, then following the fence line west to Brownsville Highway, turning north and following the Brownsville Highway right-of-way to the southern edge of the Keyport Trace Subdivision, proceeding west to the westernmost edge of the Keyport Trace Subdivision and return to the Highway 308 beginning point.

Through group discussion of the three draft LAMIRD boundary alternatives, a few more alternatives were proposed by the community. The fourth LAMIRD boundary alternative (**Alternative 4**) proposed was identical to alternative 3, but excluded any of the federally owned Museum or Naval Base property. The fifth LAMIRD boundary alternative (**Alternative 5**) proposed was identical to alternative 4, in that it excluded any of the federally owned Naval Base property, but did include the Museum property which was open to the public and not guarded or access controlled in a similar manner as the rest of the Naval Base.

A sixth proposal was discussed but not voted on. The sixth LAMIRD boundary alternative (**Alternative 6**) proposed was identical to alternative 1, in that it was the compact boundary and excluded any of the federally owned Naval Base property, but did include the Museum property which was open to the public and not guarded or access controlled in a similar manner as the rest of the Naval Base.

Votes

A straw vote was conducted of the 26 people in attendance during the meeting (not including Kitsap County staff) to establish a base preference for the LAMIRD boundary alternatives. Please note that some did arrive late and may not have signed in on the sign-in sheet. Everyone was allowed to vote for more than one alternative and hand counts were conducted by Kitsap County staff. The straw vote counts at this meeting resulted in the following results: LAMIRD Boundary Alternative One: 15 Votes, LAMIRD Boundary Alternative Two: 7 Votes, LAMIRD Boundary Alternative Three: 1 Vote, LAMIRD Boundary

Alternative Four: 2 Votes, LAMIRD Boundary Alternative Five: 15 Votes, LAMIRD Boundary Alternative Six: was not voted upon.

Agenda Item: Community Plan Vision Statement

James Weaver then discussed Vision statements, Goals, Policies, and Key Projects, the hierarchy of those elements in a community plan, and how each of those items were linked to each other. He handed out an excerpt of the Rural Lands/LAMIRD chapter including the Goals and Policies from the 2006 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan as well as an example of a vision statement from another community plan. The group discussed the general overarching countywide goals and policies and how the Keyport community plan would further refine those items to reflect the community character and clarify Keyport specific issues.

Agenda Sub-Item A: Review of Previous Vision Work

Shirl Golden and Milt Meeds led discussion of the previous vision work that was conducted, how it was collected, what was the basis of prioritization, and how it was identified in the early draft of the community plan. The group reviewed all of the past vision statements collected throughout the 2004-2005 work. Discussion of a number of the vision statements ensued with the group confirming many of the statements and posing questions or recollecting others. It was noted that some residents had moved in and some had left Keyport since the previous effort and not everyone in the group was familiar with the final vision statement that was agreed upon during that time. James committed to providing a copy of the previous vision statement to everyone for the next meeting. It was noted that, if a majority of the group was satisfied with the vision statement prepared earlier that the group could vote on that item and the future meetings could address other elements of the plan. A homework assignment was issued for each individual to brainstorm and identify a Vision statement, a Goal, a Policy, and/or a Key Project for inclusion in the plan or evaluation by the group. Everyone was encouraged to offer as many suggestions as possible.

Additional Community Comments:

- *Additional efforts to include the Keyport Trace individuals in these meetings was expressed as an important issue to the group and Kitsap County staff.*
- *Opinions from both the Navy and from the Undersea Warfare Museum regarding their preference for inclusion or exclusion from the LAMIRD boundaries is desired prior to any final community decision.*

Agenda Items: Next Steps / Future Meetings

The next meeting will have attendance with representatives of the Undersea Warfare Museum and the Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering Center. Interaction with these two institutions with the Community will be discussed. Additionally, Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development boundaries and Draft Vision Statements will continue to be discussed at the next meeting.

9:00 p.m. Meeting Adjourn

Please Note: Meeting minutes are provided by Kitsap County Department of Community Development staff with comments, questions, discussion and conversations summarized to the best ability. Any corrections or comments may be directed to James Weaver at jweaver@co.kitsap.wa.us.