
9:00 A.M.

Meeting Called to Order – Introductions.

9:05 A.M.

Continuation of a Study Session from February 27, 2001, to consider the County’s Comprehensive Plan Related Work Items Status Report to determine which tasks/policies should be examined or reviewed as part of the 2001 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Process.

John Ahl said that during this meeting the members would get a consensus of what the County will be putting forth and the items that will be discussed during the first Comprehensive Plan Amendment. He also noted that the members had received the initial docket for the Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

Jason Rice said that his goal, since having gone through the entire Comprehensive Plan process, was to prepare a current list of items needing to be amended. He said that the general amendments were listed first, so that it was easy to follow and then the textual amendments subsequent to those; going through the Comprehensive Plan chapter by chapter. He asked if the Planning Commission had compiled its list of Comprehensive Plan amendments?

John Ahl said on February 6, 2001, the Planning Commission compiled a list of items that the members wished to include in the Amendment process. He said that these are work items in general terms not in specific language.
Val Torrens thought that the Planning Commission was instructed to prepare a “laundry list”. For example, she said, one of the suggestions was the rural and industrial lands designation.

Jason Rice said that the Planning Commission would need to decide what items they would like to include for review during this process.

John Ahl said that some of these items on the “laundry list” are more than just amendments.

The Planning Commission reviewed the list of items from the February 6, 2001 meeting:

- Clustering of residences in rural areas;
- Amend the listing of Aquifer Recharge Areas;
- Rural and Urban Industrial area standards;
- Urban Growth Area (UGA) design guidelines;
- Review Comprehensive Plan document to remove bulk;
- Complete the Joint Planning Areas (JPA);
- Complete areas of more intensive rural development;
- Create an Existing Wildlife Habitat Inventory; and
- Develop an inventory of Resource Lands.

- **Clustering of residences in rural areas:**

  Jason Rice read the definition of Clustering from the Comprehensive Plan, noting that the County now has Performance-Based Developments taking the place of the former Planned Unit Developments.

  Val Torrens agreed that Clustering should be considered, but there was no policy in the Comprehensive Plan; all it stated was that the County will consider Clustering in Rural Areas.
Robin Tyner asked if the Planning Commission would take this issue on during this year’s work program to develop these standards, which will then be added to the Zoning Ordinance?

John Ahl asked if the Planning Commission developed these standards for Rural Clustering, would Section RL 10 disappear from the Comprehensive Plan?

Val Torrens said yes, if the County supported Clustering in rural areas and if the standards are completed this year so it can be included in the amended Comprehensive Plan.

Robin Tyner said that the whole section of the Comprehensive Plan on Rural Areas will need to be reviewed and she was unsure if Clustering should be looked at individually or as a part of the whole Rural and Resource Lands review.

Val Torrens felt if the entire rural section will be reviewed then Rural Clustering should be set aside until such time as it can be reviewed in its entirety.

William Matchett said if that was the case then the Planning Commission should publicly announce that this item will then be on the list of “things to do” during the next Comprehensive Plan Amendment process.

John Ahl said that the entire review of the Rural and Resource Lands was too large a chore for this year’s Amendment process.

Robin Tyner said that the Rural Lands issue was very important in this community and a review of this section will create a lot of interest.

John Ahl suggested that, for the benefit of the public, the County should identify what issues will be reviewed within the Rural and Resource Lands section.

Deborah Flynn felt that if there were too many portions of the Rural and Resource Lands that needed to be reviewed, the process would continually be postponed. She felt certain that the Rural Clustering could be handled separately during this year’s amendment process and suggested the County complete this now since it does not really involve some of the other rural issues.

John Ahl felt that the public and agencies would be well to give their opinions on this issue. He also felt that Rural Clustering could be part of the Smart Growth issue that the Board of Commissioners was beginning to develop.

Deborah Flynn noted that when she worked for Snohomish County, the staff prepared a Clustering Ordinance, which may be a good place to start to develop...
Kitsap’s program; those counties who have an Ordinance already in effect could tell us how theirs was progressing.

Val Torrens said that there is an outline already in the Comprehensive Plan, which just needs to be updated.

Deborah Flynn pointed out that the work program on the Rural Clustering would be separate from the Phase II Resource Lands evaluation.

Jason Rice thought that the work program could include a review of Interim Rural Resource Lands before it is brought into the Rural Clustering.

Val Torrens said pages 65 to 72 from the Comprehensive Plan would need to be discussed which would include Rural Villages and the Industrial and Commercial lands.

- **Aquifer Recharge Areas:**

  John Ahl asked where policy NS 10a was reflected in the work plan?

  Linda Rowe said that was located as the second item on page 3 of the Related Work Items and in the Comprehensive Plan page 83.

  Robin Tyner said that this would be a policy change, which would need to be processed by staff. She said that staff would bring the existing work program forward for amendments that they felt were necessary and then combine those that the Planning Commission would like to bring forward. She asked the members if this was another work item that the members would like to take on during this amendment process?

  William Matchett said since “year one,” citizens have wanted the County to define the Aquifer Recharge Areas.

  Deborah Flynn noted a recent article in The Sun newspaper. She felt that there were several locations shown on the map that they published that were considered recharge areas, which the County has not mapped, protected or included in the County’s Comprehensive Plan. She felt that there needed to be more protection for those Aquifer Recharge Areas by developing guidelines and policies.

  Val Torrens asked if the Kitsap County Groundwater Management Plan was supposed to outline this process together with the Public Utility District (PUD)?
Deborah Flynn felt that the County should be responsible for the Aquifer Recharge Areas, not the PUD.

Val Torrens said that the County uses the data provided from the PUD. She noted section NS 16, and questioned whether the County Groundwater Management Plan should be part of this section?

Robin Tyner said that the policy in the Comprehensive Plan would need to be updated, the maps revised; we need to verify whether a County Groundwater Management Plan has been prepared, then determine if the Planning Commission wants to develop an ordinance for aquifer protection.

- **Rural and Urban Industrial Area Standards:**

  William Matchett said that recently Darryl Piercy reviewed the Industrial areas for the Planning Commission and explained that some of the areas marked Industrial on the map were not working out and needed to be changed; what has happened to that?

  Val Torrens said that in section ED15 there was some language on the Industrially designated lands and there were several sections throughout the Work Program that addressed this issue, but nothing specific. She said this, in a sense, this would create rural vs. urban in the Comprehensive Plan which is not present at this time.

  Lary Coppola said that there is no land designation where family-wage supporting jobs can be created in this Comprehensive Plan.

  John Ahl said that economic development is a multi-faceted thing; there are many factors that come into play with this issue. Lary Coppola and John Ahl then discussed some of problems the City of Bremerton had in attracting businesses to the City.

  John Ahl felt that incentives cannot be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan, but providing suitable land in the County for commercial development should be included.

  Val Torrens stated that once the County zones specific land as Commercial, then, “zing”, the city annexes the property into the city limits.

  Robin Tyner asked if the Planning Commission wished to develop standards for commercial development in the rural areas?
Val Torrens felt that the language in the Comprehensive Plan should be tightened up to make sure that the commercial development goes into the urban areas and some design guidelines should be created for this process.

John Ahl reported that land designated Commercial on the Comprehensive Plan map was not an acknowledgment, just a fact that this was the location of the Industrially zoned land.

Jason Rice asked John Ahl if there was a concern about the designations and where they are located on the map?

John Ahl said that it should be determined where Industrial land was and whether it needed to be expanded, deleted or relocated.

Jason Rice said that a clearer definition could better define what uses could happen within those “blue blocks”. (Commercial-industrial zoned property indicated in blue on the Comprehensive Plan map.)

Robin Tyner said in the Rural Industrial areas, the Comprehensive Plan addresses Rural Master Planning. She asked if the Planning Commission preferred Comprehensive Plan Amendment language together with development language?

Val Torrens said on page 5 of the Related Work Items, there is nothing written that addresses development standards for this process.

Robin Tyner said that this section would create policies made by the Planning Commission for the Industrially designated lands. She said that generally, any policy changes should be on the docket and there isn’t enough time during this amendment process for staff and the Planning Commission to create these policies.

Val Torrens suggested that staff put a statement in the Docket that the Planning Commission will develop the criteria by a specific date and then the Planning Commission could come back to review the Industrial lands during the next review process.

Deborah Flynn expressed that the Planning Commission was mulling over those same issues again and not getting anything to happen, which was very disappointing to her.

Robin Tyner said that during this year the Planning Commission could work on developing standards for commercial and industrial development to insure that they address site size and environmental impacts for different types of commercial and industrial activities.
• Urban Growth Area (UGA) Design Guidelines.

Val Torrens said that she did not see the UGA Design Guidelines in the current Comprehensive Plan.

Jason Rice said that UGAs are listed on page 24 of the Comprehensive Plan.

Robin Tyner said there is a basic guideline when the UGA boundary is determined, then the city standards are adopted into the UGA. She said that each UGA would be unique to its individual city standard; there would not be general design standards for the entire County.

John Ahl said that this could be reflected as a policy in the design standards to make an affirmative statement.

Val Torrens said that are no issues for design standards addressed in the Comprehensive Plan.

Lary Coppola said that the same design standards should not be mandated all over the County but allow each city to be unique and create their own set of standards.

John Ahl said that the County would not make a set of standard design guidelines.

Robin Tyner asked if the Planning Commission felt that there should be a universal set of regulations for UGAs like there is now?

Deborah Flynn suggested that timing for annexations should be included in those design guidelines.

John Ahl said that in many of the UGA Design Guidelines there were statements that much of this land would not incorporate.

Jason Rice said generally speaking when the County helps the city develop a UGA, it should be a reasonable expectation that these areas shall be annexed into the city.

• Completion of the Joint Planning Areas:

John Ahl said that this item was his suggestion in order to make sure that each of the Joint Planning Areas has been clarified; all of the UGAs and the Areas of More Intensive Rural Development are reflected in the Comprehensive Plan.
Jason Rice said that the various modifications to the Joint Planning Areas and the UGAs have been placed on an errata sheet and that errata sheet will now be included into the Comprehensive Plan document during this amendment process.

- **Inventory of Existing Wildlife Habitat:**

Val Torrens said on page 5 Natural Systems this item was addressed. She asked at what point will the inventory process happen? She felt that it should be a part of the refugia study and also included in the Natural Systems.

John Ahl noted that under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) there were basin studies, which should include existing wildlife and not just fish.

Jason Rice said that eagles and osprey couldn’t be included because their nests are still required to be kept secret.

Robin Tyner said that staff would take this item forward as a work item as part of the 20-year plan.

Lary Coppola said that some of these issues needed to be assigned to a staff group.

Robin Tyner said that the Natural Resources Group is within the County and they have been so busy with ESA and watershed planning that that has taken over all of the staff time.

John Ahl said that inventorying the existing wildlife may not need to be done with other Comprehensive Plan items, but will the ESA and the salmon issues be included in the Amendment process?

Lary Coppola asked if all the concerns involved with the ESA should be addressed before the legal issues have been settled?

Robin Tyner said that there would be a statement in the Comprehensive Plan that addressed the National Marine Fisheries Service and their requirements.

- **Inventory of Resource Lands:**

Val Torrens said page 75 of the Comprehensive Plan Section RL 32 and page 2 of the Related Work Items note that there will be a comprehensive geologic study to determine the extent of the additional mineral deposits, target date 2000. She stated that the forestry issue has been tabled, and questioned whether the mineral resource lands could also be tabled until the next annual amendment. She
felt that the Mineral Resource lands should be discussed if the Planning Commission
would be reviewing Rural Clustering.

Robin Tyner said if there were a great deal of editing to this Plan, it would certainly
change its look. She said that staff would take the Resource Lands Inventory forward
as a work item.

Deborah Flynn asked if, during the editing process a section was removed, will there be
a footnote stating where this information would now be located?

Robin Tyner said yes and suggested said that editing of the Comprehensive Plan be a
policy issue.

John Ahl said that there should be a definition section in the Comprehensive Plan
instead of repeating each definition over and over again throughout the document.

Robin Tyner suggested that since the staff will be reviewing the entire Comprehensive
Plan during this amendment process, if the Planning Commission agreed, a new
document could be created for the next amendment process.

Lary Coppola said that he would like to see telecommunications facilities included in
the Economic Development and Infrastructure sections. He said that individual
provider areas should be inventoried and mapped so there is a comprehensive set of
plans or maps for all of the telecommunications providers to use.

John Ahl felt that since telecommunication companies provide facilities, the County
was not involved with this right now.

Lary Coppola said that even though an inventory of the locations of each of the
providers would be a bit of an overwhelming job, he felt that the Board of
Commissioners should mandate that the telecommunication providers tell the County
where their lines are located.

John Ahl felt that the members would like the list of where the telecommunication lines
are, but where does the Planning Commission go to get better guidance on this issue?

Robin Tyner said that if there was a policy issue for this, the Economic Development
Council could bring this issue forward.

John Ahl suggested that inventorying of the telecommunications lines be included with
a presentation from the Economic Development Council to a joint meeting of the Board
of Commissioners and the Planning Commission.
Lary Coppola said that he could organize this presentation with the EDC. He said that the telecommunication providers don’t want their competition to know where their lines are.

No further discussion being heard, the meeting adjourned at 11:09 a.m.

**DOCUMENTS DISCUSSED AT STUDY SESSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Third Item of the Revised Agenda for February 27, 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Comprehensive Plan Amendments - Initial Docket</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Planning Commission Minutes dated February 6, 2001
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