



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 Meeting: M I N U T E S

Tuesday, March 13, 2007, 7:00 – 9 p.m.

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

Meeting Facilitators: Ellen Strong, Keyport Improvement Group President
& James Weaver, Kitsap County Department of Community Development (DCD)

Meeting Attendance (from sign-up sheet): Bob & Jo Ballard, Paul Berg, Bruce & Sue Boblet, Kathy Carpenter, Doug Chamberlain, Rich & Barbara Culley, Mark and Jan Discher, Deborah DuBois, Tom Dudzic, Dick & Shirl Golden, Spencer Horning, Doug Jennings, Ednamay Kennedy, Arthur Kennedy, Charley and Mike Knapp, Gary Kohler, Alfon McFadden, Milt Meeds, Andra and Jason Murray, Ray Newell, Evonne Posten, Warren Posten, Andrew Sheridan, John Steinmetz, Karol Stevens, Don Stevens, Ellen Strong, Carol Thompson, John Thompson, Rhonda Williamson, James Weaver (DCD), Katrina Knutson (DCD) Patty Charnas (DCD, Jim Rogers (Public Works) and Barry Loveless (Public Works).

Agenda Item I: Meeting Introduction:

Ellen Strong, President of the Keyport Improvement Group, began the meeting and asked everyone around the room to introduce themselves and to describe where in Keyport they lived. The room proceeded to introduce themselves around the table. A number of attendees did enter the room later in the meeting and introduced themselves as they entered.

Agenda Item II: Regular Keyport Improvement Group Business:

Ellen Strong then discussed the regular Keyport Improvement Group Business including description of the upcoming officer elections, and the request for volunteers for an officer nominating committee. Ellen described the history of the Keyport Improvement Group and noted the group was also identified as the Keyport Community Club. The names were important to note in that when the group was solely identified as the Improvement Group, there was some hesitance from all the community participating in the group meetings and activities. She described the Keyport Community Club as a better description of the organization, but that both names were still valid. The discussion also included mention of an abandoned car, who of the proper authorities was notified, and the eventual removal or resolution of that vehicle.

Ellen Strong then turned the meeting over to James Weaver, a Senior Planner from Kitsap County Department of Community Development and the project manager of the Keyport Community Plan.

Agenda Item III: KC Natural Resources, Shoreline Buffer Discussion:

James Weaver thanked everyone for attending the meeting, introduced County staff, and then gave a brief update of the Community Planning project and discussed the importance of having public participation throughout the community planning effort. 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).

At that point James introduced Patty Charnas, the Natural Resources Manager with Kitsap County Department of Community Development to discuss the Critical Areas Ordinance appeal and remand, and the recent shoreline buffer changes resulting from that. Patty Charnas then introduced herself and began her presentation.

Patty Charnas discussed the 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 updates to the original Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) that were passed in 2005 and the subsequent appeals of that ordinance. Patty then discussed the eight appeal items that were considered by the Central Puget Sound Growth Hearings Board and the two that were found 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.

Patty continued with an explanation of wetland requirement, of the shoreline buffer issue and of the County's recent legislative action. She also covered the critical areas ordinance regulating environmental impact and mentioned the relationship with the Shoreline Master Plan, a separate program from the CAO.

Patty Charnas then proceeded to answer shoreline buffer related questions from the group.

Question: *How does the variance work? Can you do anything from the 100 foot regulation?*

Staff reply: The ordinary high water mark is where the buffer measures from. New Building within the 100 feet is not prohibited; it just cannot impact critical areas. The buffer is in place to protect fish and wildlife. Existing homes are allowed to remodel and expand up to 20% without any form of variance. You can ask for an administrative buffer reduction of up to 50% for all new development or larger remodels. A variance is one mechanism of helping people get a permit for their development plans. A buffer is not a prohibition – it establishes a zone of protection and where to begin building.

Question: *Does it help to establish a habitat that is natural to the environment?*

Staff reply: Yes. We are allowed to develop a certain structure provided that the habitat is replaced or mitigated with a buffer maintenance plan.

Question: *Would it be appropriate to establish areas for natural vegetation?*

Staff reply: James or the DCD can help you identify where these areas are appropriate.

Question: *How can this plan help to focus and prioritize Keyport as a priority for near shore assessment so we have exact buffers that truly represent the existing species and habitat?*

Staff reply: The Nearshore salmon habitat assessment is planned to begin from the south and head north. Keyport is to be assessed but will not be the first area to be looked at. Mapped information that results from the Nearshore assessment will help to update standards for developments. Site specific information is the best way to go to modify site buffers.

Question: *What modifications can you make to this plan, regardless of the data? Will they be modified when the data comes in? Will the numbers drop to 35?*

Staff reply: We do not have the data. For this community they could be modified. If we document the presence or the absence of the involved fish and wildlife habitat types, yes. It's this kind of community undertaking that could reveal that information.

Question: *Can this buffer change again?*

Staff reply: There are appeals on both sides so I do not know the answer. We may need to revisit this issue.

Question: *What is the definition of a conservancy area? Why wasn't conservancy changed?*

Staff reply: The conservancy shoreline environment areas are designated due to sensitive environments, steep and unstable areas that may provide a continuous source of beach sediment which is important to certain fish. The 10-Year update dealt with the expansion of Urban Growth Areas. We would have to redesign the Shoreline Master Plan to change these areas. We can set the stage by pursuing grants and gathering data that mesh with the 2011 updates to the Shoreline Master plan.

Question: *Can we use Navy clean-up studies?*

Staff reply: Recent site specific information is always helpful.

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 IV: KC Public Works Wastewater Discussion

James Weaver then introduced Barry Loveless, an engineer with Kitsap County Public Works wastewater division to discuss the sewer system improvement possibilities, challenges, technical details, and potential financial implications.

Barry then answered sewer and wastewater system related questions posed from the group.

Question: *How does the current capacity of the system affect the building density?*

Staff reply: We have plenty capacity in our pump system. That would be part of the analysis. It will be determined under the Land Use portion of our plan.

Question: *Is 51% of the land area, not the population, covered under that capacity?*

Staff reply: Yes – the land area decides the vote in a weighted manner.

Question: *Are package plans an option within the LAMIRD?*

Staff reply: You still have to determine where to release the water. As Keyport is not an agricultural designation, there is not a lot of potential for irrigation or landscape re-use of that volume of water. A community drain field would still require the right amount of area and the right kind of soil.

Question: *Are there grinding stations in the pumps? Will we be required to have those at each property?*

Staff reply: Grinder pumps are an option for individual homes, but it depends. There are two options: You can either pump uphill with individual pumps and pressurized lines or it can all flow to a low spot and we can put in a county owned pump station to pump over the ridge to the existing system. Everybody may be able flow by gravity to the county station, but that may not always be the case. It depends on the real estate and terrain.

Question: *How much does it cost to replace a septic tank?*

Staff reply: It averages about \$20,000, depending upon the particular requirements of the site.

Question: *Is the Naval base considered part of the community? If so, where does their waste water go?*

Staff reply: Yes, the Naval base wastewater ties into the downtown pump station and then is pumped to the Brownsville treatment plant, similar to the rest of the community.

Question: *Is there anyway the county can convince the government to help build the community?*

Staff reply: This existing system was created when there was federal money to pay for it. Presently and most likely into the future, the County does not have adequate funds to provide sewer infrastructure in advancement of the development as the Federal funds for the infrastructure no longer exists.

Question: *Who pays for this and who votes? The residents or property owners?*

Staff reply: The property owners typically vote in a weighted manner (based upon area) and pay all the levies in a similar weighted manner (based upon area).

Question: *Does \$20,000 connect property owners to the system?*

Staff reply: The amount of the levy provides the sewer line stub to your property line. You could then build a gravity line to the stub.

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.

Question: *Do we have to install grinder pumps in any expansion? Do we need an additional grinding unit?*

Staff reply: It depends upon whether you install a community wide system or individual systems, the grinder pumps 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 flow to gravity.

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 that will have to be evaluated by the community. Tying them in may be more costly for the overall community. It may be that having the Keyport Trace area as a separate Local Improvement District (LID) may be a more equitable system.

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

Staff reply: The majority of all the improvements would be voluntary but the assessment would be mandatory for all parcels within the Local Improvement District area (LID). It may make more sense, financially, for the community to come together and provide a unified LID proposal, but that isn't required.

Agenda Item V: KC Transportation and Pedestrian Improvements on 308

James Weaver then introduced Jim Rogers, a representative Kitsap County Public Works Transportation Planning division to discuss the pedestrian improvement possibilities, challenges, technical details, and potential joint projects with the State of Washington and Kitsap Transit.

Jims distributed two documents and spoke of the Mosquito Fleet Trail and the bike route map. He informed the group that a Park and Ride is being considered for the Keyport area.

Jim then answered transportation and pedestrian related questions posed from the group.

Question: *Are there any plans to widen Brownsville Highway?*

Staff reply: The existing transportation plan is to have standard shoulder widths for bike safety.

Question: *What is the width of Highway 308?*

Staff reply: I believe the existing shoulder width is 8-10 feet.

Question: *What is the process in creating a separate pedestrian path?*

Staff reply: Separated pedestrian paths are always challenging in that additional right of way is typically required. If Highway 308 were not a state right-of-way, it may make things easier in that Kitsap County would be the only jurisdiction involved. It is possible to approach in a partnership between the County, the State, and the adjacent parcels. We need to evaluate who owns the properties and their willingness to participate.

Question: *Does the Mosquito Fleet trail connect all of the Mosquito Fleet docks?*

Staff reply: It makes an attempt to provide pedestrian and non-motorized connections to the historic Mosquito Fleet landings and communities. We are hoping to integrate a number of the designated routes in the existing roadways and enhance the trails that already exist.

Question: *Is the purpose for bikes and pedestrians?*

Staff reply: The trail purpose is for both bikes and pedestrians and also to promote tourism.

Question: *The nearest way for a pedestrian to get out of Keyport is 2 hours walking distance away. Will a bus service be provided? How can Kitsap Transit provide some sort of service to Keyport?*

Staff reply: Kitsap Transit said they were not planning on anything coming out here in the near future due to the lack of rider ship, but it something that can continued to be explored with them.

Question: *Could we put a bus shelter at the museum?*

Staff reply: If we could access pedestrian travel through the gate, it could be the transit point for all of Keyport.

Question: *Has the navy actually articulated a concern with that gate? It can't be security because the gate is not manned.*

Staff reply: It is a security issue due to the infrastructure located near the Museum Gate at Washington Avenue. No one has addressed all of the issues yet, but we hope to begin a discussion at the next meeting when both Navy and Museum representatives would be in attendance.

Question: *Is 25 mph at Washington Avenue appropriate? Most people are not stopping or slowing for pedestrians.*

Staff reply: A stop sign or traffic calming may be incorporated in future community projects. One idea was to create a community center as a focal point for the intersection of Highway 308 & Washington Avenue. A specialized paving pattern, such as cobblestone or similar transition, could create a traffic calming effect.

Question: *Will a rural village designation increase our chances of getting those kinds of things?*

Staff reply: By having the documents of the planning process, it provides a unified and adopted community vision at the same time showing a commitment to that plan and the identified priority projects. This is essential in many grant applications and extremely beneficial when competing with other communities for priority funding.

Agenda Item VI: LAMIRD Boundaries Update

James Weaver thanked Patty Charnas, Barry Loveless, and Jim Rogers for their presentations and providing all this information to the community. James then discussed the total of six alternatives for the Keyport Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development boundaries. James explained the original three that were presented at the February 27, 2007 meeting and then discuss the three additional boundary alternatives that resulted from that meeting. James also highlighted the resulting votes for each boundary alternative from the February 27th meeting and noted that the results were included in the minutes from that meeting.

James spoke of a mailing that was going to be initiated to all of Keyport, Keyport Trace, and parcels within the surrounding area to secure more public involvement from these areas. The mailing will include the access to an online survey, evaluating opinions on issues ranging from LAMIRD boundaries, key projects, land use and subdivision and other items discussed in these meetings. James also indicated the results of that survey would be available to the group at the May 8th meeting.

A question was raised whether the entire Port District could be included as a seventh LAMIRD boundary alternative. James Weaver responded that pursuit of that as an alternative is always a possibility for the group, if they desire. James did add that the difficulty in inclusion of the entire Port District Boundary was that the boundary was quite large and did include numerous large rural parcels that may not meet the definition and Washington State regulations regarding defining the Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development boundaries. This option was briefly mulled by the group, but no further action was requested to add a seventh Alternative.

Additional Community Comments:

- *Opinions from both the Navy and from the Undersea Warfare Museum regarding their preference for inclusion or exclusion from the LAMIRD boundaries was again a priority prior to any final community decision.*

Agenda Items: Next Steps / Future Meetings

The next meeting is anticipated to have attendance of representatives of the Undersea Warfare Museum and the Keyport 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.