
A. Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order and made introductions

B. Approval of Minutes

July 9, 2004 – A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by John Ahl that the Planning Commission minutes of July 9, 2004 be approved as amended. Motion carried. Monty Mahan abstained.

July 20, 2004 – A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by John Taylor that the Planning Commission minutes of July 20, 2004 be approved. Motion carried.

August 31, 2004 – A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by John Ahl that the Planning Commission minutes of August 31, 2004 be approved. Motion carried. Tom Nevins, Monty Mahan and Lary Coppola abstained.

C. WORK STUDY

1. Updated Direction of the Department of Community Development
Eric Baker – reviewed important issues that staff, 1) expects to bring forward in the near future, between now and end of 2004 and 2) determines are of general interest.

NEAR FUTURE

E. Baker - One of the items coming up first on November and December calendars is the 9-lot short subdivision ordinance that has already been before the Planning Commission and generally not well received. Staff is currently reviewing the previous document as well as documents from other jurisdictions and is working together with the development community to prepare drafts of a Short Plat Ordinance, combining all elements into one document. Staff is looking to the Planning Commission to review and make a recommendation on the new draft in late November or December. (NOTE: Board of County Commissioners public hearings remaining in 2004: November 15 and 22, and December 13). Some important facets of this ordinance are: 1) the fine balance between urban and rural and should these have the same standards. Other jurisdictions do not treat them the same; 2) Types of urban standards whether a person should have to meet them or not. This is the difference between a full plat and short plat. 3) Additionally, there are a number of other code development items that will be coming forward in a package similar to last year. Changes may include: 1) Additional allowed uses in rural areas adjacent to Rural Industrial areas. Industrial zoning in rural areas is very difficult to expand according to the GMA. There are uses that may be appropriate, but appropriate for full-on industrial designations that come with an Industrial designation. Staff is currently working on what uses may be appropriate such as composting, stump grinding. These types of uses are needed due to the onset of the burn ban. 2) Staff is currently updating SEPA regulations to bring them into compliance with current WAC. For the past three years, staff has been operating under the State WAC but needs to update County Code to match the State WAC. That is the goal. 3) There are Definitional clarifications that need updating. He explained Vertical and Horizontal
Analysis for the County Code. Vertical takes each general section of the Code and tracks each section back to the RCW directive. This is a huge task but that is very beneficial. Horizontal takes in all the various Code titles for definition, titles, etc. to assure clarity of verbiage. For instance, abutting means abutting, adjacent means adjacent, etc. This should make the Code easier for the public and staff to fully utilize this resource.

4) There will be additional CAO updates with public hearings beginning in January. Other items of interest: 5) dredging project in Driftwood key. 6) Staff is working with the community to obtain an exemption from the Shoreline Management Act.

- Dean Jenniges – Questioned requirements through the Corp of Engineers.

E. Baker – There is a wide variety of permitting beyond the County. Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Corp are included. Talking in this case of maintenance dredging.

GENERAL INTEREST

Cass Crematorium. A contentious development that will be located in Navy Yard City. Staff working on streamlining the permitting process for this application. In situations like this where there are few additional impacts, such as landscaping and screening requirements, interior remodels, traffic, parking and impervious surfaces, staff makes every attempt to expedite straight to the building permit process to avoid a site plan review at a cost of $1,700 and $2,500 for staff to say there are no additional impacts. Even though this application qualifies for expediting procedures, it still is not the best fit for fast track because of the controversy. The site held a previous landscaping business that is now being converted to a crematorium. The landscaping business was more intrusive on the site than the crematorium will be. One employee, short hours, no additional landscaping needed, no access problems and ample parking. A specific concern however is what is referred to as the “Creepy factor”. The location is commercial
zoning surrounded by residential with a school close by. Another issue is possible mercury seepage from teeth fillings from individuals being cremated. Puget Sound Clean Air Agency has reviewed the entire proposal and does not see any significant air quality adverse impacts or potential mercury impacts. The Hearing Examiner heard the application and left the record open until October 25, 2004. Question is whether the zoning is appropriate for the area. The issue of non-conforming use in non-compatible zoning was explained. The landscaping business was only allowed in a Highway Tourist Commercial zone, the most permissive and expansive of all commercial zones. HTC may have been appropriate for the previous use but may not be appropriate for the current application. There are more crematoriums in Kitsap County than is known. This could be concerning to elderly citizens and children and the County needs to be sensitive to this perception.

E. Baker - Staff is reviewing preliminary plats and vested applications from the early 90’s. Legal issues have delayed completion. The County Code and the State statutes address expirations of these and provides an opportunity for one final extension to complete the applications. Requests will be reviewed and staff will determine validity of extension. Ultimately, the Hearing Examiner will make the determination on whether or not to grant an extension. Deadlines for submittal and development will be given. Within approximately two years, these plats and applications should be off the books, one way or the other. Long Range planning currently deals with the issue of should a parcel adjacent to a UGA be included in or excluded from that UGA.

- Jenniges – Thinks the decision of incorporation should depend on what the community decides. He also questioned whether a review of the building codes will take place in coordination with local contractors.

E. Baker – Due to State mandates, Kitsap County moved to IBC and IFC in June of 2004. Through that process, the County will
work extensively with the Home Builders Assoc. and many developers. This needs to be listed on the Department’s work plan.

- Michael Gustavson – On the expiration of application for development issue, asked if staff time will be credited toward the expiration time. In other words, if an old application has been set aside or misplaced for a period of time, does this count against the developer’s right to proceed by missing the deadline waiting for County review.

E. Baker – Staff is working hard to move these forward in a timely manner. Much of the introductory work has been done. There are many issues such as site inspections in the permitting process needing to be accomplished first before the Hearing Examiner makes the final determination.

Cindy Baker – Staff has not held up any applications. They are either under appeal or some other regulatory enforcement or owners themselves have held up development by not wanting to continue. Staff is trying to get these off the books by processing each one and either canceling the application or moving it through the Hearing Examiner process. There are none waiting in a drawer. The County, by State law and local County ordinances, only has 24 after which extensions are allowed for specific reasons.

E. Baker – The new Kingston high school is the last item to point out that is now in the process of obtaining County approval. The Hearing Examiner has approved the application for the school to be located on West Kingston Road. The project has a number of sensitive issues. It is an old Nike site that once contained contamination that has since been mitigated. However, the concern of locating a school over the site once containing contaminants brings of the question of future impacts. Impacts have been determined to not be significant by the EPA. The Hearing Examiner’s approval of this application was appealed to the Board of County Commissioners that subsequently upheld
the approval. It has since been appealed to the Superior Court but not on the environmental impact as much as on screening, wildlife corridors and other such items.

- John Ahl – 1) Issues needing to be visited: The schedule for the 2005 Comprehensive Plan update process; 2) Status report on IRF issue; and 3) LAMIRDs that might be in the works.

- Jenniges – Wildlife Corridors was discussed on July 9, but not discussed again after that.

E. Baker – That discussion related to the Comprehensive Plan Amendments associated with wildlife corridors and language inserted per State requirements for GMA compliance. It was during the discussion of fish and wildlife habitat. The CAO will be the predominant document for discussion on wildlife corridors. The CAO will most likely be coming up for public hearing in January of 2005.

- Chair Nevins – Asked to see a listing of the applications currently vested in Kitsap County.*

E. Baker – Staff can provide this for the Planning Commission.* Vesting has particular timelines and invalidity dates. Due to Comp Plan and legal issues, staff has allowed up to 12 years in some cases for deadlines to extend out until issues can be resolved. It is now time for them to move forward.

- Gustavson – Asked that the request be enlarged to include the number of buildable parcels included in each application.* This would help answer the question he has been asking for some time. How many undeveloped parcels are there in Kitsap County? This information should be easy to obtain through the Assessor’s Tax ID numbers. Developers maintain there is no land to build on and this data could prove that to either be true or false.
• Jenniges – Referenced military housing needs.

• John Taylor – Asked for introduction of new Planning staff members in the audiences. Introductions were made and projects assigned to them were referenced.

C. Baker – Said that bios will be provided on each new planner for the Planning Commission to review. The Long Range Planners will be set up by Commission district to provide a lead planner in each district to be the contact person for the Commissioners to ask questions about projects in their district.

• Jenniges – Hopes this does not become compartmentalized in that staff contacts do not communicate with each other.

C. Baker – Weekly staff meetings are held as a group discussion forum and continual informal communication is held among the planning staff.

C. Baker – Status Reports:
• KRCC met this morning prior to this meeting.
• Will be providing an update on the CAO ordinance.
• A Best Available Science panel is set for public participation. It will not be specifically for the Board of County Commissioners or the Planning Commission, but will be panel driven for public involvement. The date is October 27, from 6-9 PM at the Central Kitsap Jr. High, located behind the CK High School. Directions will be provided. The speakers that staff wanted have confirmed their attendance and will be available to answer BAS questions based on their knowledge and expertise. A large ad will be in the newspaper three times prior to the date.
• The next regular scheduled Planning Commission meeting is October 26. Since there is currently no business scheduled for that meeting, staff would like to cancel that meeting in lieu of the following night BAS panel. The Planning Commission polled its members and agreed to cancel the October 26, 2004 meeting. Staff will prepare a
revised legal notice and transmit it to the County’s newspaper for publication.*

C. Baker - Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) – A consultant was hired and staff has convened a group of stakeholders comprised of a mix of regulatory professionals and County citizens. This group is meeting once a week on Wednesdays. Issues under discussion include assumptions on critical areas, various assistance to provide knowledge base for the GIS staff to prepare their maps. She continued to explain methodology used by the group and is hoping to have the ULCA finished by December. Staff will provide more information as it is available.

- Gustavson – Reminded the importance of discussing sewers vs. non-sewers in the Discussion.

C. Baker – Will be meeting on this issue in two weeks with the group and are hoping to make those assumptions.

- Ahl – Again asked for the number of taxed parcels in the County not developed.

C. Baker – Hesitates because the Department has no way of knowing if the taxed parcel is usable or not. However, once that number is released to the public, it becomes fact. Staff does not want to give out information that is not meaningful.

- Ahl – Given this information, he withdrew his request

- Gustavson – Still need to know the net Buildable lands available in the County.

- Lary Coppola – Asked for names of BAS panelists.

C. Baker – Allen Johnson, a stream expert, Diane Sheldon, a wetlands expert, Robert Crititan, a Bio-statistician recommended by KAPO. Chris Petri, a groundwater expert, and
Ted Labbe, a fisheries expert from the Suquamish Tribe. (Labbe has subsequently withdrawn from the panel).

- Jenniges – Questioned why Don Flora was not invited.

C. Baker – He is a member of KAPO and KAPO preferred Crititan. However, staff will be happy to invite Flora. The intent is to bring together as many experts in the field as possible to have a meaningful discussion with the citizens of Kitsap County. Questions will be asked for on the Internet and will be picked at random.

C. Baker - Population Allocation – discussed this morning at KRCC. This matter was previously before the Board of County Commissioners for discussion and public hearing. It was continued to the Board’s October 25, 2004 public hearing. Planning Commission members are invited to attend. At the previous hearing, the question was asked why the numbers are not at mid-range thus adding approximately 4,000 additional population. During the KRCC discussion this morning, it was noted that the numbers were presented for discussion only and it now appears the 4,000 will be divided up for discussing various scenarios. The City of Bremerton will accommodate a portion of the 4,000, City of Poulsbo and City of Bainbridge Island did not want to take any of the 4,000 additional population number.

- Coppola – Asked what number Bremerton has left over from the previous allocation and why allocate more until existing numbers are satisfied.

C. Baker – With new buildings going up in downtown Bremerton and more ships coming to PSNS, additional numbers for Bremerton seems logical. There is a note in the Population Allocation that instead of doing the 5-6 there is a recommendation to do 76-24. Once reviewed, wait five years and do again. KRCC still has to vote on this.
• Gustavson – Asked if there is any attempt being made to review trend analysis or what growth is taking place on the ground. There is a tremendous amount of growth in South Kitsap and with the new Narrows Bridge, a great deal more is anticipated. Thinks it a good idea to study areas where people are moving instead of guessing at possibles for certain areas.

C. Baker – Prudential is coming close to looking at such issues but at a vacancy perspective rather than where people are moving. Statistics exist in the census tracks with TAZs. More will be known at the sub-area level in the Port Orchard/South Kitsap, Kingston and Silverdale. Building permits only show where a person is going to locate, not where they are moving from originally. Staff relies on The Sun’s View on demographics.

• Taylor – An attempt was made last year by staff to gather the above-discussed data, but it was unsuccessful. C. Baker will make another attempt to acquire the pertinent information from the local MLS.* Also, some real estate companies track a buyer’s previous site address when they sell a house.

Patty Charnas – Reiterated the BAS panel of people with expertise in the science field. The Internet will provide an area for questions people want answered. This October 27, 2004 panel discussion will have two large ads in The Sun. The CAO Wetlands chapter contained some errors and omissions. Staff distributed a new packet today to replace the previous section A cover memo accompanies the new insert and identifies where each document belongs.

• Gustavson – Thinks there are still four missing sections.

Charnas – Will check Gustavson’s binder specifically to ensure all information is there.*
C. Baker – Staff relied on King, Snohomish and Pierce for information in the packets because they have much larger biologist staffs. All of their articles are not individually listed, but if that is Gustavson wants these articles, staff will get them for the Planning Commission in hard copy.*

- Gustavson – King County is not a fair comparison. King County Executive, Ron Simms, has tied up 65% of parcels over 10 acres. This acreage cannot be touched or be used for any development. Also, the terrain is very different from that of Kitsap County’s and does not think the County should broadcast a mindset that it is relying strictly on these three large counties for scientific data.

C. Baker – Kitsap County is not using all criteria from the three counties. It is a matter of not having staff to re-do a complete analysis. Kitsap County has not accepted all criteria from the three counties, only using the BAS to make a determination.

- Monty Mahan – Wants to see copies of studies cited by Commissioner Gustavson. Gustavson will provide as well as Charnas will work directly with the Planning Commissioners to obtain all studies referenced and discussed.*

C. Baker – Will provide names of staff in King County who can explain their articles in detail.*

- Coppola – Questioned BAS used in King County. If they have land locked up that can’t be used as stated above, asked if they used BAS to justify this action and if so, is Kitsap County sure it wants to use the same BAS.

C. Baker – Does not believe they used BAS particularly to acquire the unusable land. She will explore the rationale behind purchasing 65% of property over 10 acres.* It may be similar to Kitsap County’s open space acquisition. The BAS panel will explain what land acquisition means for their particular science.
• Coppola - Does not think the panel is necessarily unbiased based on previous comments from at least one of the panelists.

C. Baker – Staff tried to get a broad range of experience so as not to be accused of leaning one way or the other. Believes some of the panelists will say that there is a wide variety of answers and that it is site specific. Wants them to say so rather than she as the Department of Community Development Interim Director.

• Gustavson – Recommends that at some point in the CAO process that the County identify the specific site problems needing to be resolved. Once the problem is defined, a solution is presented. Problems cannot be solved in aggregate because they are conflicting problems and each issue is different.

C. Baker – Kitsap County needs to make decision about what it wants to preserve, or not, and how much. The science experts can say what they think it will take to protect resources. It then becomes a political issue in that if the decision is made to preserve less than BAS identifies, then preservation is not an option. Will stop because she wants to save the arguments for the panel. This is a subject that needs to be broached because it is wide and varying.

• Jenniges – BAS is looked at with a jaded eye. It can be slanted and interpreted any way one prefers. Thinks Flora has a grasp of everything currently under discussion in the CAO ordinance.

C. Baker – The two people she selected for the panel are very well balanced and have their own opinions.

• Jenniges – Believes summer streams that are declared tributaries to various creeks are bogus.
C. Baker – Questions being asked now by Planning Commission members are ones that should be asked of the panel members. Hopefully the Planning Commission will receive information needed to make its recommendation on the CAO.

Chair Nevins – Called for a five-minute break

Ditmer – Staff is working to complete many projects such as Land Capacity Analysis, Population Allocation out to 2025 and the Comp Plan amendments (CPAs) for 2004. October 25, 2004 is the public hearing date when the Board of County Commissioners should make its final decision on the Adoption Ordinance. The results of the Board’s decision will be mailed to the Planning Commissioners and all other interested parties, hopefully by this coming Thursday.* Following the Board’s decision, staff will be starting on the 2005 CPAs, which requires much preparation work. Between now and January, using the same schedule as 2004, the potential completion is for April or May through August. This depends on the Planning staff’s workload relative to the pre-application and application process and on the number of applications submitted. In January, staff will begin the community outreach process, North Kitsap, Central Kitsap and South Kitsap. Citizens will be informed that the County is starting the 2005 annual Comp Plan process. Another item on the work plan for 2005 is the seven-year Comp Plan Update review. The State requires this under GMA. All initial amendments to the docket will be compiled, presented to the communities, North, Central and South and then presented to the Planning Commission. It is important to know how the various communities feel, hear their comments about what they would like to see in the amendments. Following this, staff will go forward with an initial draft docket beginning in 2005. The previously addressed projects will be a heavy workload on staff for the remainder of 2004. Relative to the Interim Rural Forest (IRF) issue, the Hearings Board decision of August 10, 2004, requires staff to compile a second phase of the IRF process. In 2004, staff presented the Planning Commission with the policies
to be used to amend the Comp Plan. These would change IRF to a Rural Wooded designation. The Hearings Board had policies in place to back-up this change in designation and asked that staff develop the implementation program to make this happen no later than August 1, 2005. A work program to complete this requirement will be prepared over the next two months. It will most likely be laid out in a two-program format. Staff is asking for funding to hire a consultant to assist with the program. Whether or not the Board of County Commissioners approves funding for a consultant, staff will still need to complete this task. The goal is to be ready to proceed by January 1, 2005. At Commissioner Ahl’s request, LAMIRDs will be reviewed. Staff intends to look at this issue countywide with standard criteria. For instance, the recently approved LAMIRD at George’s Corner is a Commercial LAMIRD, while Suquamish and Manchester are more Village LAMIRDs. Standardized criteria will be helpful when reviewing all potential LAMIRDs outlined in the Comp Plan. In addition, Interim Department of Community Development Director Cindy Baker talked about centers at KRCC on a Planning Director’s level. She will be taking lead on this issue and will be looking at ways to fold the Centers concept into the LAMIRDs. This will take place over the next six to nine months. The Planning Commission will be kept apprised as issues evolve. Lastly, the only issue left on the work plan to discuss is Subarea Plans. The individual Planner assigned to each Plan then detailed specific progress to date.

- Coppola – Asked if staff thinks there will be very many CPAs in 2005.

Ditmer – Listed number of applications accepted in the past three years, noting the trend is downward/declining. Subarea Plans are working to address peripheral sites in lieu of individual site-specific rezone and land use requests.

- Coppola – Since plan will undoubtedly be appealed, asked about the deadline to do so and how long the process takes.
Ditmer – Will outline appeal process in letter being sent out Thursday.* Also will list appellants if the Plan is appealed.*

- Mahan – Asked for the fastest method to access the Hearings Board decisions.

Ditmer – Staff gets information from Prosecutor’s legal council. If Planning Commission members want it sooner, call Laura or Holly and the Community Planning staff will try to obtain this information.*

- Chair Nevins – Will email the GMHB Website to other members of the Planning Commission.

- Gustavson – asked about completion timeline anticipated for the Port Orchard /South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan. This project has been in the works for two years. Thinks the UGA, once established, will drive many decisions on issues such as commercial and urban development. Need to satisfy the number for expected growth.

Ditmer – Have deadlines by end of this year to list achievement goals. Additionally, Subarea Plans can only be adopted on an annual basis so in 2005, Subarea Plans that are slated for completion are Kingston, Suquamish and Port Orchard/South Kitsap, and in 2006, Silverdale also including any peripheral Community Plans.

- Ahl – One of the items debated at length this past year is the Reasonable Measures. The GMHB’s decision states the County must finalize the list. Does this mean that what is already drafted will be included in the Comp Plan?

Ditmer – Kitsap County already has some in place in policy and code that are implementable as well as some that are in policy but not in Code and some to potentially review at a future date and will continue to develop those.
• Ahl – Told that the Planning Commission will have a chance
to consider new entries before codification and to satisfy
the GMHB’s requirements.

Ditmer - Between now and end of the year, staff will be working
on the overall work plan showing month by month what is to be
accomplished. This will be presented to the Planning
Commission when completed.

C. Baker – The Reasonable Measures discussed previously this
year, have gone through the public process and are considered
to already be in place but new ones will be coming to the
Planning Commission to analyze.

Keri Weaver – Gave a brief bio and noted updates to be done on
both the Kingston and Suquamish Sub-Area Plans. These are
on track for the 2005 CPA docket. This is a very short timeframe
for both projects. Last year’s Kingston Sub-Area Plan was
adopted in December of 2003, based on an interim population
allocation figure for Kingston. Staff is now producing the
numbers that should take Kingston through 2025. In 2005, this
one issue will be reopened to determine if there is sufficient
capacity within the UGA to accommodate the estimated
population out to 2025. As part of that process, other issues in
Kingston will also be revisited such as water and fire flow and
updated traffic information based upon action taken within the
UGA. There is a working group established similar to the
current Kingston Citizen Advisory Committee. The first meeting
was help September 15 and the CAG is scheduled to meet again
on November 17. It will be looking at draft revisions to the Sub-
Area Plan, hopefully ready for release to the public by the end of
January 2005. Work on Suquamish Plan is an update to the 1999
approved Plan. Since this Plan is older that the rest, it is a little
outdated. Updating will be done to bring the Plan up to current
information and conditions, addressing any new GMA
requirements not addressed in the 1999 Plan and revisiting
minor issues that the public did not feel received enough
attention, i.e., design standards, parks and trails and other
community facilities. If anything major is identified such as
reopening SEPA, it will then be deferred to 2006. Weaver then
explained the numerous methods used to garner citizen
involvement and participation on the CAG.

Ditmer – Introduced Betty Capehart to discuss Silverdale and
noted she would be working with Dulce Setterfield.

Capehart – Gave a brief bio of her background in Planning and
stated that the Silverdale Plan is scheduled out over an 18-
month period and will be part of the Comp Plan review in 2006.
She is currently completing two contracts for consultant
services for the Silverdale Subarea Plan. A large Citizens’
Advisory Committee (CAC) was formed with 30 members to date.
The backgrounds of the members are very diverse. The
Committee will be preparing a public involvement strategy.
Since this is a large group to work with on a monthly basis, she
hopes to break out into smaller committees based on interests
and then come back together in the large group to discuss the
issues. Due to budget constraints, at this time staff is putting
forward Phase I of the Subarea Plan. Between now and January
of 2005, staff will be doing public awareness strategy as well as
developing and drafting a SEPA/GMA compliance strategy for
the project. The idea behind working on a Subarea Plan and
combining this with environmental analysis is to have much of
the environmental analysis completed when the Plan comes
before the Board of County Commissioners for review.
Currently, Capehart is working with the Natural Resources staff
on Chico Creek and Barker Creek Watershed Plans. The goal is
to integrate the land use Subarea plan with watershed planning
to view all different systems comprehensively and in the end,
produce the best plan possible.

• Jenniges – Referenced three major groups that will surface
during public participation on the Silverdale Subarea Plan
and noted that problem issues may arise with the
Bremerton vs. Silverdale encroachment.
• Ahl – Questioned if any thought has been given to a previous practice of non-voting Planning Commission members serving on study groups for communities such as Suquamish, Manchester and Kingston.

Ditmer – Each Subarea Plan and the Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) should have ex-officio members from the Planning Commission in attendance to bring information back and forth. Staff will compile a list and make sure a Planning Commission member is on every citizen group.*

• Taylor – Questioned what is being proposed to mitigate the traffic congestion every day in Silverdale.

Betty – Transportation is big topic that will be analyzed and resolved in the process.

Ditmer – Suggested that the Transportation Division of Public Works come to the next Planning Commission meeting and give an update presentation on this issue* Also, transportation issues is the next item Betty Capehart will be addressing in the Silverdale Subarea Plan.

• Jenniges– In the original Silverdale Sub-Area planning process, much concern was expressed over Silverdale becoming another traffic congestion area similar to East Bremerton. Unfortunately, this is now the problem particularly on Bucklin Hill and Silverdale Way.

• Coppola – The Department of Transportation (DOT) gave a presentation approximately two months ago to the Economic Development Council (EDC) listing out their future plans in the Silverdale area. It might be helpful for the Planning Commission to see that presentation.

Capehart – Will talk to the DOT Transportation Planning Group.*
Kitsap County Planning Commission – October 12, 2004

• Taylor – Wanted it noted for the record that he drove Newberry Hill Road and it is very nice.

Ditmer – Eva Khoury will be Ditmer’s co-partner in the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area planning process. Have a Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) scheduled for tomorrow afternoon followed by an open house. Invited any or all of the Planning Commission to attend and see the consultant, EDAW’s presentation of work completed to date. Much of the background work, including GIS, is underway. A Technical Team meeting was held and they met for two days with focus groups. These groups gathered stakeholders from the City, County and previous advisory groups. The intent of these meetings was to gain and understanding of the issues and concerns in the South end and to discuss what the potential study area boundary will be for the process. The study area boundary is not intended to be included in the UGA but rather to be studied. After the area is studied, the determination will be made as to whether certain areas belong in the UGA boundary. Tomorrow night’s meeting will most likely address what was determined to be a study area boundary. By the end of the year, staff must produce a population report to the public and the City and must have a draft policy with Code. This document will outline potential alternatives and will not have a preferred alternative at that time. In 2005, January through March, the preferred alternative out of this process will be determined, provided to the public, studied and then through the Planning Commission process. By the end of 2005, staff should be three quarters of the way finished.

Khoury – In addition to Ditmer’s comments, Khoury noted there will be another two CAG meetings by the end of 2004. The next meeting will be November 1, and last Friday’s Tech Team meeting went well. Included in the group are the consultants, Critical Areas staff and Public Works’ Transportation Planner. Progress looks good over the past two weeks.
Ditmer – There will also be two more open houses and will keep the Planning Commission updated relative to all meetings.*

- Taylor – Thanked staff for today’s presentation and ask for list of staff members’ names, phone numbers, areas they are working on, etc.*

C. Baker – Staff will bring more handouts with specifics in the future.*

- M. Flynn – On last year work plan, concern was expressed over the growing housing cost gap in the County and how to address it. A countywide forum to address housing costs was discussed but nothing has been done to date.

C. Baker – Believed M. Flynn is referring to a Housing Summit staff and the Planning Commission agreed to have with the Home Builders Association (HBA), Housing Authority (KCCHA), Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) and other groups involved in this issue. Does not think it realistic to produce a quality job at this time on something this important given the workload and timelines on which staff is currently working. HBA has agreed to take the lead on this. They have a Housing Summit prepared, but not to the scale staff originally intended. It will possibly be held in January 2005. She will check to see if it is either January 5 or 6.* It will be held at the Eagle’s Nest Conference Center. HBA has an agenda prepared and is lining up speakers who will address housing costs and other related issues.

- Mahan – asked for status of the Department of Community Development Director position.

C. Baker – Outlined the process and related dates.

- Taylor – Asked for clarification of the Board of County Commissioners’ October 25, 2004 public hearing.
C. Baker – Noted that the Board continued the hearing from a previous date, additional testimony will be heard and staff is hoping for a decision at that time.

Ditmer – Staff is still in finishing stages of finalizing consultant teams’ contracts for the various subareas. Will present a list of all contracts at one time to the Planning Commission when completed. This will be used to compile the 2005 work plan designed to assist the Planning Commission in knowing what is expected to be discussed month to month. This will be provided to the Planning Commission by the end of 2004.

Old Business

NONE

New Business

NONE

Other Business

Charnas explained what Commissioner Gustavson thought was missing and she will provide additional verbiage that still needs to be included in the CAO binders.

10:55 AM - No further business being heard, a motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by John that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried.

Exhibit No. Description
A. October 12, 2004 Agenda
B. Notice of Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA Plan &EIS: Public Informational Open House Announcement
C. Minutes correction notes
D. Letter to the Board of County Commissioners and Planning Commission regarding CAO/BAS forum set for 10/27/04
E. Notice of Port Orchard/South Kitsap Subarea Plan and EIS Open House set for 10/13/04
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