

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING APRIL 12, 2005

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Eagle's Nest Conference Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton, Washington 98311. Members Present: Tom Nevins, Michael Gustavson, John Ahl, Lary Coppola, John Taylor, Deborah Flynn and Dean Jenniges. Member Absent: Mark Flynn, Monty Mahan. Staff Present, Cindy Baker, Angie Silva, Albert Williams, Jim Bolger, Cindy Read, David Nash, Consultant Mark Personius and Planning Commission Secretary Holly Anderson. Five members of the public were present.

9:00 AM

A. Acting Chair Tom Nevins called the meeting to Order and introduced the Planning Commission members present.

Approval of Minutes

B. March 22, 2005 Minutes

A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the Planning Commission minutes of March 22, 2005 be approved. **Motion carried.**

C. Public hearing to consider oral and written testimony on options for the Kitsap County Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) methodology and assumptions, (unincorporated residential portion). The ULCA will be used to determine the amount of residential land available for distribution of populations reported in the 2004 Countywide Planning Policies.

1 Cindy Baker, Director, Department of Community Development (DCD)
2 – Made the staff presentation expressing the need to be sure all
3 information on the Land Capacity Analysis issue were covered and
4 all questions answered. Baker introduced Mark Personius,
5 consultant on this project who has done the majority of the
6 oversight. She also introduced Cindy Read and Dave Nash, County
7 Geographical Information System (GIS) staff, present to answer
8 logistics of the numbers used in the methodology. Lastly, Baker
9 introduced Angie Silva and Albert Williams, co-lead staff on this
10 project who compiled the large packets of information distributed
11 today. Lastly, she introduced Jim Bolger, Acting Manager for Long
12 Range Planning and Manager for the Natural Resource Division of
13 DCD. Baker referenced the packet noting that most of the
14 information was previously reviewed by the Planning Commission.
15 There is however some last minute corrections needing addressed
16 and inserted in the packets and Baker walked the Planning
17 Commission through these changes. Baker did not intend to re-
18 address material already covered. She referenced each document in
19 the packet without further explanation if there were no changes.
20 First, the Land Capacity Analysis is an estimate of available land.
21 The citizen committee who worked on this process, attempted to find
22 balance in the assumptions, not in the overall outcome. Following a
23 briefing Monday with the Board of County Commissioners, there
24 were some issues that needed updating but there was no time
25 between the meeting and this morning's public hearing to make
26 those changes. Most changes for example are clerical errors, not
27 substantive in nature. There is only one substantive change that she
28 will address shortly. The committee roster needs to have each
29 member's affiliation noted. A new table provides additional detail on
30 the explanation of Options 1 and 2, relative to the re-developable,
31 underutilized lands. Attachment 7 is a summary of the Updated Land
32 Capacity Analysis and shows it to be for the unincorporated UGAs
33 for vacant lands and for buildable lands with totals. It also
34 summarizes all data compiled and gives population estimations with
35 the Updated Land Capacity Analysis. Attachment 9 is new. It is a
36 comparative analysis. The Board asked that an additional Option 1A
37 be included which is a comparative between Options 1 and 1A.
38 Option 1A slightly changes the assumptions on re-developable,
39 underutilized land and on sewer availability. The table in 1A explains
40 the differences, not the analysis, just the assumptions. However,
41 upon review, page 3 assumptions did not change and Angie Silva

1 distributed an insert showing the changes in assumptions. Baker
2 noted that when all edits and changes are completed, the Planning
3 Commission will be given a new, cleaned up version. Attachment 10
4 is new and is an explanation of 1A, further explaining the re-
5 developable, underutilized lands in detail. This attachment reaches a
6 deeper level of detail than most prefer but it is now available if
7 needed. Attachment 11 uses Silverdale as an example, showing the
8 numbers that support the previous explanation of Options 1 and 1A.
9 There was one math correction in Attachment 15 that Baker noted for
10 the Planning Commission members. She compared the old and new
11 document. The original document showed 197 but should be 209.
12 This only applies in Silverdale. Attachment 12 printed out too small
13 and a new, more readable version was prepared to replace the old
14 one. Attachment 13 is new and lists comments from the Kingston
15 Subarea work group. Attachment 14 is a letter detailing input from
16 city planning directors. These are for reference and not new data.

- 17
18 • Dean Jenniges – Why go to Option 1A. The valuation is set by
19 County Assessor and if he reads this correctly, Option 1A will
20 change that.

21
22 Baker – This analysis contains only two assumptions; the remainder
23 stays the same. The Board of County Commissioners objected to
24 two of the assumptions.

- 25
26 • Jenniges – Residential properties are evaluated on three
27 factors. Asked if the factors in 1A are the Assessor's factors or
28 do they relate to the reclassification of the land.

29
30 Mark Personius – Option 1A only looks at how re-developable land is
31 defined for the purposes of the Updated Land Capacity Analysis.
32 Also included are the two suggested changes the Board of County
33 Commissioners asked be made. 1) Re-defining criteria for how to
34 classify underutilized land; and 2) the formula discussed on how to
35 measure sewer constraints—the distance from sewer to lots and how
36 much of a constrain this puts on potential re-development.

- 37
38 • Jenniges – Regarding re-developable lands, asked if this was
39 not up to the landowners and if so, why has criteria been
40 established for the landowner.

1 Personius - The landowners' activities are unknown. This is a model
2 an accurate model attempting to predict what landowners will do
3 based on factors to assist them in determining whether they want to
4 re-develop. It lists items such as zoning, parcel size, access, sewers,
5 etc. that will be placed in the model.

- 6
- 7 • John Ahl – Asked if the public has seen the revised packet.
8 Procedurally this is not a regular public hearing in that normally
9 both the public and the Planning Commission has had an
10 opportunity to review the final documents and a written
11 recommendation from staff is provided for the Planning
12 Commission to consider.

13

14 Baker – The public has had four opportunities previously to review
15 the material.

- 16
- 17 • Ahl – The only public he sees present are those familiar with the
18 process and/or have served on the committee.

19

20 Baker – Asked for Ahl's preference at this point.

- 21
- 22 • Puzzled by today's process that seems more like a work/study
23 session where Baker is explaining what apparently the Planning
24 Commission members have already seen numerous times.
25 Apparently the public is supposed to hear and make its own
26 judgment.

27

28 Baker – Items in the packet that have not changed, have been seen by
29 all and are the basis for the hearing. She proposed she end her
30 presentation at this time and open the hearing up for public
31 comment.

- 32
- 33 • Ahl - Asked if the Department of Community Development has a
34 recommended alternative and Baker responded yes. He then
35 asked that Baker state staff's recommendation.

- 36
- 37 • John Taylor – Thanked Cindy for taking the time to present a
38 quick overview of the documents prior to a more detailed
39 presentation.

40

1 Baker – Reiterated that the public has reviewed the material in the
2 packets on which staff will base its recommendation. There were
3 however some clarifications necessary based on staff’s meeting with
4 the Board. This Updated Land Capacity Analysis process is moving
5 ahead quickly since there are subarea plans waiting for this
6 information that has been under analysis since January. The most
7 critical information needed to make a recommendation has been
8 presented a total of four times prior to today’s hearing. Baker can
9 state what the Department of Community Development thinks is the
10 appropriate assumption and agreed with Ahl that today’s process
11 was somewhat unusual but she wanted the Planning Commission
12 members to have everything that the Board of County
13 Commissioners has to assist in making their recommendation.

- 14
- 15 • Deborah Flynn – Questioned the various alternatives, a
16 question that was also raised at the last presentation on
17 Updated Land Capacity Analysis. It is a legal question. Seems
18 there is some confusion as to whether the Byron Harris option
19 is available as an alternative.
- 20

21 Baker – Harris is not finished with his alternative analysis and will not
22 be until the end of this year. Staff needs to finish and has decided to
23 go forward. Harris looked at lots that he thought would be available,
24 but not a cross-section. This skewed utilizing any of his data.
25 Legally, the Harris/Prudential alternative is not a choice at this time.

- 26
- 27 • Jenniges– Expanded on Ahl’s concern that with previous
28 issues there was more public participation.
- 29

30 Baker – Technically, this should not officially be going through a
31 Planning Commission public hearing process. Next year, if there are
32 any changes, it will not. The Updated Land Capacity Analysis is an
33 implementation tool and should not have been in the Comp Plan at
34 all. It will be removed from the Comp Plan at the end of 2005. It will,
35 however, be brought before the Planning Commission for a
36 work/study to garner the Commission’s thoughts and opinions on the
37 Updated Land Capacity Analysis, which is how it is handled in other
38 jurisdictions.

- 39
- 40 • Michael Gustavson – Concerned about “urban” residential
41 lands when there is a population allocation that includes the

1 entire county, urban and rural. This addresses his concern as
2 to whether there will be enough rural parcels available for
3 development to accommodate the portion being allocated to
4 rural. This addresses his concern as to whether urban needs to
5 be expanded enough to accommodate the total population
6 allocation and that a harder look needs to be taken at urban
7 population.

8
9 **Baker - This will take place as soon as the Updated Land Capacity**
10 **Analysis decision is made by the Board of County Commissioners.**
11 **Staff and consultant will shift toward subarea planning and analyzing**
12 **the rural population. Updated Land Capacity Analysis will**
13 **automatically be reviewed in five years. This was a Kitsap Regional**
14 **Coordinating Council decision. The Department feels it has adequate**
15 **information at this time to make the decisions needed.**

- 16
17 • **Gustavson – The other significant item is the impact of the**
18 **Critical Areas ordinance (CAO) regarding available lands. He**
19 **notices that in the urban areas, staff is allocating average**
20 **wetland buffer to increase from 75 to 85 feet. Yet the County’s**
21 **proposal for wetland buffers is 200 feet. These are significant**
22 **departures and thinks this issue needs to be settled before**
23 **making a recommendation on the Updated Land Capacity**
24 **Analysis.**

25
26 **Baker – When the Updated Land Capacity Analysis began, it was**
27 **thought that work would be completed on the CAO. The challenge**
28 **was in how to get a head start on this issue, even if it changed, in**
29 **order to make a comparison. The comparison was made to show the**
30 **Planning Commission the difference. Because a new CAO was not**
31 **adopted, staff, by law, must select the existing ordinance (Option 1).**
32 **Option two in the packets has proposed assumptions to see how it**
33 **will impact the numbers. However, the Board of County**
34 **Commissioners will analyze each assumption but currently want**
35 **across the board assumptions so they can “mix and match”**
36 **accordingly. There are seven assumptions on which the Board will**
37 **make its decision based on assumptions only, not the numbers.**

38
39 **Mark Personius – Under Option 1, critical areas are measured in the**
40 **GIS database as mapped, not typed. Therefore it is unknown if the**
41 **wetlands are types 1-4. Those are the State classifications. Instead,**

1 wetlands are measured and evaluated on types 2 and 3, based on
2 staff review of actual applications received. Under the current Code,
3 buffers for Type 2 and Type 3 are 100 feet and 50 feet respectively.
4 An average of 75 feet was then used in the current analysis to
5 measure. For Option 2, it is estimated that an additional 10 feet will
6 be added under the proposed Critical Areas ordinance.

7
8 Baker –Responded to Lary Coppola’s question that the Harris option
9 would have been number 5.

- 10
11 • A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by John Ahl
12 that the Planning Commission open the public testimony
13 portion of this hearing followed by the County declaring its
14 preferred option.
15
16 • D. Flynn – Thought the public should have the option to
17 comment on the County’s preferred option.
18
19 • Coppola – Withdrew his motion.
20
21 • Acting Chair Tom Nevins recapped:
22
23 1. County’s preferred option
24 2. Public testimony
25 3. Planning Commission deliberation and recommendation to the
26 Board of County Commissioners

27
28 Baker –There are two re-developable lands in 1A and it focuses on
29 sewers. Baker prefers Option 1A and she read through the
30 assumptions. Believes what the Board would like from the Planning
31 Commission is to know what assumptions it prefers as being the
32 most reasonable and balanced of the different assumptions. For
33 example, Attachment 4 starts with re-developable, underutilized
34 lands as the first assumption that is a reduction factor. This means
35 you start out again with total gross acreage for vacant and
36 underutilized lands. The Department of Community Development
37 favors a compromise between 1 and 2.

- 38
39 • Jenniges The Citizen Advisory Group recommendation shows 6
40 votes for Option 2 and 1 for option 1. Asked if staff was
41 ignoring the Group’s recommendations.

1
2 Baker – 1A is a combination of Options 1 and 2. This is why the
3 Department favors Option 1A. The first page shows the total gross
4 vacant acreage and the next page is underutilized. This is the total
5 residential land identified on the GIS mapping. Option 2, page 3, is
6 the re-developable, underutilized lands, a reduction factor.

- 7
8 • Jenniges – Underutilized implies it can be re-developed.

9
10 Baker – That is correct.

- 11
12 • Jenniges – Referenced another status, re-developed,
13 underutilized land.

14
15 Baker – Explained that the first page shows a starting point with
16 vacant and underutilized lands. This is the big picture. Next is the
17 reduction factors, including underutilized, because these are not
18 going to all be included by taking them out or leaving them in. It will
19 It will not be 100% of the underutilize lands. Page 3 shows
20 assumptions for reducing the re-developable and underutilized lands.

21
22 Personius – explained Option 1 in detail and responded to the
23 question of how many lands will redevelop in the next 20 years. The
24 methodology for Buildable Lands in Options 1 and 2 are very similar.
25 Taken into account is parcel size, zoning and home value. These
26 factors determine the likelihood of a parcel actually subdividing. The
27 differences between Options 1 and 2 address how large the parcel
28 will be before it becomes unlikely to subdivide. Therefore, in the
29 Urban Low zone, Option 1, if the parcel is 5 times the minimum
30 zoning size, it would only redevelop if the building value is less than
31 1 ½ times the median value of the home in that UGA. Median home
32 values differ within each UGA. This recognizes the different values
33 within each UGA. Parcels 2 ½ acres or more in an Urban Low zone
34 were removed from the inventory. Option 1A looks at increasing the
35 cap size, i.e. any parcel 10 times the minimum zoning size becomes a
36 five-acre parcel. This adds anything over five acres back into the
37 inventory. Next, Option A states that if the whole parcel is more than
38 10 years old it was likely to re-develop but not so if less than 10 years
39 old, Option 1A does not consider the year the home was built and
40 recognizes that parcels at least ten times the minimum zoning size
41 should be left in the inventory. It is thought that at some point, the

1 parcel size out weighs the value component of the home that is
2 already there.

- 3
- 4 • Acting Chair Nevins – Does not follow the acreage associated in
5 this option given that five times the minimum zoning size would
6 be 1 acre not 2.5 acres in Urban Low zoning.

7

8 Personius – The total minimum size needed to place an additional
9 home would be 4/10 of one acre.

- 10
- 11 • Acting Chair Nevins – Does not know of any ½ acre zone within
12 a UGA.

13

14 Personious – There are no minimum lot sizes in zones, just density
15 size.

- 16
- 17 • Acting Chair Nevins – This indicates that 10 acres in an Urban
18 Low Zone would have the capacity for 50 homes. Clarified that
19 if the property is greater than 10 acres then it is likely to re-
20 develop but if under 10, it is very likely to re-develop regardless
21 of the home that is already there.

22

23 Personius – That is the intent of Option 1A, to make sure that the
24 larger parcels stay in the inventory, regardless of the home value.

- 25
- 26 • Gustavson – A house has to be quite old to justify tearing it
27 down because often it is less expensive with a house that is 20-
28 30 years old to remodel than destroy and re-build. Also, the
29 first person to build on a parcel will most likely build on the
30 best location, which typically creates a problem for re-
31 development to the maximum allowed.

32

33 Personius – There are properties that could accommodate more
34 dwellings but the existing home is sitting on the best site.

- 35
- 36 • Coppola - Asked for clarification that Option 1A does not
37 consider the age of the house. Options 1 and 2 still consider
38 the age.

39 Baker – The Board removed this consideration from Options 1 and 2
40 because of the rapid increase in property values. Option 1A allows
41 for a property owner to remove dwellings from the property and

1 construct several new ones. The Board believes it is to the citizens'
2 advantage not to value the home. The difference between 1998
3 regulations and the proposed Option 1A is approximately 4 acres.
4 This is the best guess in what can be done to calculate in Updated
5 Land Capacity Analysis. It is defensible and has more reality, and
6 even with more scrutiny, the analysis is basically the same.

- 7
- 8 • Acting Chair Nevins– Understands the Departments preferred
9 Option is 1A and proceeded to open the public comment
10 portion of the hearing.

11

12 PUBLIC TESTIMONY

13

14 Art Castle – Executive Vice President of the Home Builders
15 Association and a member of the Citizens Advisory Group, thanked
16 the Department of Community Development staff for conducting a
17 fair and open process. Throughout this process, there was much
18 constrain exercised, always looking for a defensible model. Castle
19 suggested that some reality be added to the re-developable lands.
20 Option 1A presumes that lands will re-develop to a higher density
21 over the next 20 years and as previously stated, will be revisited
22 again in five years. Thinks Option 2 is preferred or some minor
23 modifications could be made to Option 1. As to Option 1A,
24 suggested both the Board and staff take another look at a
25 methodology dealing with sewer constraints, judging distance to
26 parcel size. Sewer constraints are a major concern. Castle read a
27 summary of comments on Options 1 and 2, giving rationale for these
28 being his preferred options. Castle submitted the written comments
29 for the record.

30

31 Vivian Henderson – Her comments were mostly housekeeping
32 issues. She asked staff to remove her name from the group since
33 Dick Brown was appointed to represent Kitsap Alliance for Property
34 Owners (KAPO) in this matter. Henderson expressed her
35 disappointment that not many committee members were present and
36 asked if the other members knew that Option 1A is the Department of
37 Community Development's preferred choice--and if not, asked that
38 the meeting be continued.

39

40 Fred Depee – South Kitsap resident – Said that the more technical an
41 issue, the fewer citizens attend. In Option A, Attachment 9, Depee

1 favored removing the year of building—this is not as important as the
2 condition of the house. When acquiring a parcel for development,
3 age is not a relevant condition. The options listed in the documents
4 were reduced down. The assessed value of property is more of a
5 contributing factor than stressed in the options. Depee assumed
6 that the Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) thought Harris was
7 discounted because the data was from a market point of view and did
8 not think it was given enough credence. In the end, he was in favor
9 of Option 1A.

10
11 No further testimony being heard, Acting Chair Nevins closed the
12 testimony portion of the public hearing.

- 13
- 14 • Gustavson – Asked Baker where the “People per household
15 size” language came from and she confirmed it came from
16 census data.
 - 17
 - 18 • Jenniges – Understood Fred Depee’s testimony to indicate his
19 preference to be Option 2 but in the end, he stated he was in
20 favor of Option 1A.

21
22 Baker – Reiterated that staff made every attempt to provide the best
23 assumptions and that the Planning Commission needs to make a
24 recommendation on the best assumptions because the various
25 options already exist.

- 26
- 27 • D. Flynn – Asked if the Citizens Advisory Group was introduced
28 to the Committee members.

29
30 Personius – Following the Citizens Advisory Group’s work, Option 1A
31 came by design and discussions with the Board. The Committee
32 produced all options except Option 1A. Staff did not make its
33 recommendation known prior to this public hearing.

- 34
35
- 36 • D. Flynn – For clarification asked if staff changed its
37 recommendation to Option 1A because the Board of County
38 Commissioners wanted this option.

39 Baker – All assumptions were discussed.

40

1 • Coppola – Asked if the Committee would have a chance to
2 explore Option 1A, or not.

3

4 **Castle – The Citizens Advisory Group did not have a chance to**
5 **review Option 1A. It did however recommend the first four options**
6 **plus Harris/Prudential.**

7

8 **Baker – Concurred that the Citizens Advisory Group did not review**
9 **Option 1A.**

10

11 • Gustavson – Asked how other jurisdictions completed the Land
12 Capacity Analysis without first addressing sewers.

13

14 **Baker– Agreed that the sewer component is a troublesome issue.**

15

16 • Coppola – Sewers drive the process. If sewers were addressed
17 first and the infrastructure in place, then developing
18 underutilized land would not be such a large issue.

19

20 **Baker– Studies have shown that land costs will increase in 2-3 years**
21 **with or without sewers because of value. Without analyzing sewers,**
22 **the market factor is reduced.**

23

24 • Taylor – Thinks the driving market factor for developable land is
25 sewers in all documentation. Gave examples in Silverdale area.
26 Sewer lines are determining market factor. It is very expensive
27 for developers to do.

28

29 **Baker – Sewers have been in the planning process for the Updated**
30 **Land Capacity Analysis.**

31

32 • Nevins – Reiterated to his fellow Planning Commissioners that
33 the issue needing addressed today is to consider public
34 testimony, deliberate and make a recommendation to the Board
35 of County Commissioners on Updated Land Capacity Analysis.

36

37 • Jenniges – Referred to Art Castle’s concern over Critical Areas
38 ordinance and age versus condition of a structure.

39

40 **Personius – The County Assessor does an analysis of fair, good or**
41 **excellent condition of a structure. Possibly for the next analysis,**

1 consideration of age versus condition would be a good idea to
2 address. When exploring and formulating Option 1A, it was
3 discovered that more in-depth analysis did not change the outcome.
4 First number came out to be the best number.

5
6 Baker – Noted that the home value was incorporation in the analysis.

- 7
- 8 • Jenniges – Using Esquire Hills as an example, he said that the
9 capability of the land to perk is an important factor.
- 10
- 11 • Taylor – A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by
12 Michael Gustavson that the Planning Commission’s
13 recommendation on Updated Land Capacity Analysis be
14 delayed and that a presentation from sewer purveyors be
15 scheduled. Taylor needed to know how future sewer problem
16 would be handled.
- 17
- 18 • D. Flynn – Uncertain that obtaining sewer information at this
19 time is prudent and could not see how it relates to the issue at
20 hand. She suggested getting sewer information in the near
21 future.
- 22
- 23 • Coppola – Thought several planning issues should be stopped
24 until sewer issue is satisfied.
- 25
- 26 • Jenniges – Agreed with Deborah Flynn and thought Options 1
27 and 2 did consider sewers. He was prepared to move forward
28 with a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners
29 on current information provided.
- 30
- 31 • Gustavson– Displayed a map prepared for him for the
32 Department of Community Development staff at his request that
33 he interprets to indicate zero gain on sewer lines.
- 34

35 **THE VOTE:** In favor of the motion—Michael Gustavson and John
36 Taylor; Against the motion—Dean Jenniges, Deborah Flynn and Tom
37 Nevins; Abstained—Lary Coppola and John Ahl.

38
39 **The Motion died for lack of majority.**

40

1 A motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by Deborah
2 Flynn that the Planning Commission accept and recommend to the
3 Board of County Commissioners, Option 1A as proposed by the
4 Department of Community Development staff.

5
6 **DISCUSSION:**

- 7
- 8 • Jenniges – Analysis can go on forever but staff has prepared an
9 acceptable analysis for the Updated Land Capacity Analysis. A
10 precise, exact Land Capacity Analysis can never be reached.
11 All issues have been considered and thought that the previous
12 motion made prior to the one now on the floor, was an attempt
13 to hold up the process. At this point, it is the best estimate
14 possible.
 - 15
 - 16 • D. Flynn – All options proposed are good in some way; it is a
17 very close estimate. It appears that some Planning
18 Commission members want more concrete data. She asked
19 Baker if this is defensible relative to the Critical Areas
20 ordinance and was told yes. She noted the only difference
21 between 1 and 1A is sewers and undevelopable land. There is
22 enough information to enable the Land Capacity Analysis to
23 move forward to the Board of County Commissioners.
 - 24
 - 25 • Gustavson – Was told yes when he questioned if the analysis
26 produced an actual number for land capacity.
 - 27

28 Baker – Reminded the Planning Commission members that this
29 analysis is strictly for the unincorporated Urban Growth Areas. The
30 County now needs to take reasonable measures and said that the
31 logic involved in the vision, may be no development. However, this
32 is the initial step needed and without it, subarea planning cannot
33 continue further.

- 34
- 35 • Taylor – Asked for the purpose and overall goal of the Updated
36 Land Capacity Analysis packet.
 - 37

38 Baker – Updated Land Capacity Analysis is a requirement of the
39 Growth Management Act, looking out 20 years. The State of
40 Washington provides counties with the Office of Financial
41 Management (OFM) best guess range. The process has been a

1 bottom-up approach. The Board of County Commissioners made its
2 decision via Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). The
3 population figures are established and the County now needs to
4 determine if expansion is needed in the unincorporated Urban
5 Growth Areas. Also need to determine the cities' visions.

- 6
7 • Jenniges – Option 1A is the best option to avoid over-
8 analization. He reminded his colleagues that this matter would
9 be reviewed in five years. Because of the Board of County
10 Commissioners' concerns, staff needs to plan for sewer
11 coordination.

12
13 Baker –For the Land Capacity Analysis issue, an in-depth sewer
14 analysis can be conducted with still no concrete conclusion being
15 reached. She did suggest however that a sewer information
16 work/study be scheduled.*

- 17
18 • Coppola – If this issue will be addressed in five years, He asked
19 if it will begin in five years or be finished in five years.

20
21 Baker – It needs to be monitored every year.

22 23 THE VOTE:

24
25 In favor of the motion—Dean Jenniges, Michael Gustavson, Lary
26 Coppola, Deborah Flynn, John Taylor and Tom Nevins; Against the
27 motion—0; Abstained—John Ahl. Motion carried.

28
29 Motion carried.

30
31 A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Lary Coppola
32 that Kitsap County sewer purveyors, both urban and rural, be asked
33 to address the Planning Commission relative to their goals and
34 answers to address the sewer issue. The Planning Commission
35 needs to know how to solve the problem of lack of sewers in the
36 UGAs.

37 38 DISCUSSION

- 39
40 • Jenniges – Asked what mechanism could be used in
41 developments to save sewer plans.

1 Baker - Suggested a letter be created by the Planning Commission
2 requesting more information on sewers and then she will discuss
3 this with the Board of County Commissioners. Would like to
4 approach the Director of KRCC, Mary McClure, to obtain some
5 direction on this issue. She also wants to talk with Art Castle
6 regarding his findings on sewers.

- 7
- 8 • Taylor – Thinks the Planning Commission should rely on Baker
9 to arrange the correct people to be involved in a sewer
10 discussion. *
 - 11
 - 12 • Ahl – The citizens have asked that taxes not be imposed. This
13 is an activity of electeds.
 - 14
 - 15 • Taylor – Noted that the County Road Program is all mapped out
16 both annually and in five-year increments.
 - 17

18 Baker –The same plans exist for sewers.

- 19
- 20 • Ahl – Believes the motion on the floor is an exercise in
21 frustration. A good place to start would be with those areas
22 that are involved with the UGA planning.
 - 23
 - 24 • Coppola –Suggested that the press be invited and also
25 recommended amending the motion to determine if there is a
26 plan for sewers.
 - 27
 - 28 • Gustavson - Sewers are basic infrastructure.
 - 29

30 Baker – Will check into timeframe.*

- 31
- 32 • Jenniges – A good discussion topic at the upcoming Planning
33 Commission retreat would be the mechanism used by the
34 County to support UGAs to in turn, support a sewer plan based
35 on funding such as grants.
 - 36

37 **THE VOTE:**

38
39 In favor of the motion—Michael Gustavson, Lary Coppola, Deborah
40 Flynn, John Taylor, John Ahl and Tom Nevins.; Against the motion—
41 Dean Jenniges. Motion carried.

1 Old Business: NONE

2
3 New Business:

4
5 A reminder was noted of the Planning Commission retreat to be held
6 at the Givens Community Center, April 26, 2005, beginning at 9 AM.

7
8 11:08 AM - No further business being heard, a motion was made by
9 Lary Coppola and seconded by Tom Nevins that the Planning
10 Commission public hearing be adjourned. Motion carried.

11
12 Exhibit No.

Description

- 13
14 A. April 12, 2005 Agenda
15 B. Public sign-in sheet
16 C. PowerPoint presentation prepared for Cindy Baker
17 D. Updated Land Capacity Analysis packet presented
18 by Cindy Baker
19 E. Hand-out submitted by Art Castle of the Home
20 Builders Association of Kitsap County
21 F. Planning Directors' comments on Updated Land
22 Capacity Analysis
23 G. Kingston comments received on Updated Land
24 Capacity Analysis
H. 25 Draft agenda for the April 26, Planning
26 Commission retreat
27 I. Email message from Monty Mahan stating he will
28 not be able to attend the April 12, 2005 Planning
29 Commission meeting
30 J. April 12, 2005 Legal Notice

31
32 Minutes approved this _____ day of _____, 2005.

33
34
35
36 _____
37 Tom Nevins, Acting Chair

38
39
40 _____
41 Holly Anderson, Secretary