

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION January 11, 2005

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Eagle's Next Conference Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton, Washington 98311. Members Present: Tom Nevins, John Ahl, Michael Gustavson, Monty Mahan, Mark Flynn, Lary Coppola, John Taylor, Dean Jenniges and Deborah Flynn. Staff Present: Cindy Baker, Eric Baker, Jim Bolger, Angie Silva, Keri Weaver, Eva Khoury, Andy Bergsagel, Cindy Read, Brynan Pierce, James Weaver, Paul Nelson, Consultant Mark Personius, Secretary Holly Anderson. *The Sun* reporter, Chris Dunagan and two citizens in the audience.

9:00 AM

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

9:05 A.M.

Approval of Minutes

B. November 23, 2004 Minutes

It was decided that action on the November 23, 2004 minutes would be postponed until the next meeting on January 25. Holly Anderson will redistribute a draft copy to the Planning Commission, Board of County Commissioners and staff for review.**

C. A motion was made by John Ahl and seconded by John Taylor that Vice Chair, Mark Flynn, be appointed Planning Commission Chair for calendar year 2005. Motion carried. A motion was made by Deborah Flynn and seconded by Dean Jenniges that Monty Mahan be appointed Planning Commission Vice Chair for calendar year 2005. Motion carried.

1
2
3 **D. WORK /STUDY SESSION**

4
5 **1, DCD update**

6
7 **Cindy Baker, Department of Community Development Director**

- 8 • **Thanked the Planning Commission for attending the holiday**
9 **luncheon prepared for them by staff members.**
10 • **Thanked staff for their efforts in making the luncheon a**
11 **success.**
12 • **Complimented the Long Range Planning staff for their hard**
13 **work during difficult times and staffing changes. Jim Bolger is**
14 **covering the position of Community Planning Division Manager**
15 **on an interim basis until vacant positions are filled. Currently**
16 **Community Planning staff is four positions short, with an**
17 **overall vacancy situation of 11 positions total in the**
18 **department. Additionally, five employees have had surgery**
19 **recently and were or are still absent for over six weeks each.**
20 • **Introduced Mark Personius, consultant for Updated Land**
21 **Capacity Analysis and listed the various tasks Mark has**
22 **contracted to perform for Kitsap County. Personius and staff**
23 **are getting close to completion on this project. Once**
24 **completed, the information will be forwarded to the subarea**
25 **planning teams to review the UGAs and reasonable measures**
26 **and to determine if an expansion of UGAs is warranted.**
27 • **Subarea Plans will be addressed and updated today. Staff will**
28 **define problem areas within the planning process and resolve**
29 **them. These decisions are made with much analysis.**
30 • **Although not an issue that will come before the Planning**
31 **Commission, the Fire Code is almost completed.**
32 • **Permit numbers have increased from last year.**
33 • **Major issues needing resolution last April are about to come to**
34 **fruition.**
35 • **Asked for questions on overall programs for the Department.**
36 • **Announcements are out to fill vacant positions. The message**
37 **should be disseminated that these postings can be found on**
38 **the County's website. Have a couple leads for possible**
39 **temporary relief.**
40 • **Introduced the Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) issue.**
41 **Explained background of committee set up by former DCD**

1 Director Kamuron Gurol, noting there is a wide range of
2 opinions. C. Baker needed to familiarize herself with the
3 subject and spent time listening and asking questions. In order
4 to proceed forward, the Committee agreed to focus on solutions
5 by coming up with different options on analysis. Using 1998 as
6 standard methodology, the group agreed to tweak some of the
7 assumptions, ending up with various options. Not intending to
8 select only one, will instead present options as a whole. Will
9 ask for concurrence with assumptions made in the analysis.
10 Most important is for basis to be strong with substance prior to
11 coming up with the numbers. This avoids perception or
12 preconceived notions that attempts are being made to end up
13 with an already selected number. Baker expressed excitement
14 about process and asked for feedback from the Planning
15 Commission members. Staff remains open to change.
16

17 2. Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) Update

18
19 Mark Personius – Presented a PowerPoint overview of the ULCA
20 process to date (See Attachment A) and distributed a more in-depth,
21 detailed explanation of the methodology options, assumptions and
22 some discussions amongst member of the Citizen Advisory Group
23 (CAG) over the past three months. This information will also be
24 presented to the Board of County Commissioners at tomorrow's
25 work/study session. This analysis lists five alternative
26 methodologies: 1998 County Comp Plan Methodology; 2002
27 Buildable Lands Analysis Methodology; Option #1-2004
28 Methodology; Option #2-2004 Methodology; and Option #3- Byron
29 Harris/Prudential Real Estate's Methodology. They are preparing
30 their own Land Capacity Analysis. This in-depth analysis shows that
31 the 2004 methodology utilizes the GIS database to quantify actual
32 critical areas and their buffers. These are based on the currently
33 adopted CAO. Personius explained specific criteria under the CAO
34 relative to buffers and density transfer. For the PowerPoint
35 presentation, Personius explained each topic listed on slide No. 1,
36 ULCA Criteria (Reduction Factor Assumptions) before proceeding to
37 highlight each topic with further explanation based on assumptions
38 and methodologies, (See Attachment A, slides 3-12). These include:
39 1) Total gross acreage-(vacant and underutilized land). ADUs are
40 excluded from this analysis; 2) Re-developable underutilized land.
41 Small, shoreline parcels of less than one acre in size are excluded

1 from analysis; 3) Critical areas. This involves deducting critical
2 areas from the net available vacant and re-developable and
3 underutilized lands; and 4) Infrastructure constraints. This is an area
4 authorized by the State’s Buildable Lands guidelines but has not
5 been utilized to date. The idea was to identify lands infeasible for
6 sewer extension at this time. Purveyors maintain they can
7 accommodate current growth however many extenuating
8 circumstances could lead to infeasibility. At the same time, 20 years
9 of land capacity analysis must be considered in that over time, the
10 lines will be extended. When this happens, the land capacity
11 analysis will change. This is complicated by the lack of a detailed
12 sewer study to provide information on parcel-by-parcel analysis.
13 This issue took the most discussion time of any issue before the
14 CAG because of the impact on land capacity and the inevitable
15 change. The last component of this analysis was to exclude sewer
16 constraint from any Urban Restricted zone (1-5 units per acre),
17 typically heavily impacted by critical areas. Lastly, not proposing to
18 place constraint on water availability although this could become
19 issue in the future; 5) Roads/ROW (future). Recommended under
20 option 1 is an increase the reduction factor from 1998’s 17% to 20%
21 based on considerations from Public Works Department and
22 Developmental Engineering Division of DCD. Approved plats are
23 showing increasing amounts of land devoted to roads and parking in
24 driveways; 6) Public facilities (future) other than roads. It is
25 recommended to maintain a 15% reduction factor, same as used in
26 1998 and the Buildable Lands Analysis; 7) Unavailable lands. This is
27 considered by many to be a market factor, looking again at vacant
28 land unavailable for development due to landowner or legal
29 constraints. In 2004, a lower reduction factor than used in 1998, is
30 suggested based on added infrastructure constrain not considered in
31 1998. Could not find where any unavailable land factor methodology
32 was used in 2002 Buildable Lands report. Lastly, once a net available
33 vacant and underutilized lands count is determined, a population
34 capacity will be available to compare with the future 20-year
35 allocation to make the assumption whether or not there is enough
36 room within existing UGAs or if further action is required. Based on
37 the Board’s desires, Personious and staff are now ready to run the
38 numbers to see how far apart they are; and 8) Person per dwelling
39 unit.

40

1 Personius - Defined Underutilized lands as any developed parcels
2 that can accommodate additional development based on their current
3 zoning. He also noted differences between previous assumptions
4 used and those used currently. Overriding all of this is the goal to try
5 and get a better sense of reality into the methodology with less
6 reliance on assumptions made in other jurisdictions and
7 communities; data that either could not be accurately verified locally
8 or that data locally is more accurate. Goal has always been to find
9 the best data locally. The outcome hoped for is data that will
10 determine lands likely to redevelop in the next 20 years. To
11 accomplish this, spreadsheets will be prepared for every UGA that,
12 when completed, every assumption will depict how many units will
13 fall into a category. In other words, if you change the assumption,
14 the number of re-developable lands will also change. He concluded
15 (Slide 13) by noting: Established assumptions without knowing
16 outcome; Schedule; Reasonable measures during Subarea planning;
17 Where to go from here, using one option or combination.

18
19 C. Baker – County staff is sharing all information with Prudential and
20 working together with Byron Harris to come up with the best data
21 possible. For example, Prudential is taking the market factor used by
22 the County that is a standardized percentage and then reaching a
23 reality check. Even though staff is not sure how the Growth
24 Management Hearings Board (GMHB) will receive this, the desire is
25 there to utilize all options for the best end result and acquire the
26 widest breadth of knowledge.

- 27
- 28 • Michael Gustavson – Questioned actual gross acreage
29 definition. He then expressed his opinion that sewer capacity,
30 infrastructure and installation will be the stopping point for
31 increased development and higher density rates. Addressed
32 legal issues he submitted to be distributed to the entire
33 Planning Commission. It was requested that the handout be re-
34 mailed.

35
36 C. Baker – Jim Bolger will be working on water rights issue.

- 37
- 38 • Gustavson - Questioned roads vs. access to new construction.

39
40 C. Baker – Consultant and staff are looking at growth connectivity.

- 1 • Ahl – Expressed concern that because military families are
2 included in the census figures, yet on-base housing assets
3 numbering in the thousands are not, any estimates of housing
4 shortfalls in the County would be distorted. In other words, it is
5 troubling that the County’s inventory of available housing is not
6 sufficient to accommodate the number of people living in Kitsap
7 County because the inventory does not include Government
8 owned housing.

9
10 C. Baker – Interesting concept and warrants further discussion.
11 When a ship comes into port, literally thousands of families must
12 locate into the Kitsap community. She also mentioned that the
13 Tribes and Bainbridge Island are not factors. These issues warrant
14 further discussion.

- 15
16 • Dean Jenniges – Made suggestions as to how to factor in Navy
17 housing on base vs. off base. Further, the military are well
18 counted for.

- 19
20 • Gustavson – Need to get the accumulative aspect into the
21 calculations.

22
23 Personius – GIS is compiling the aforementioned spreadsheets
24 where every line will show deductions and assumptions. When
25 ultimately completed, the gross number can be inserted and the
26 output net number to come up with the ultimate reduction factor. The
27 upcoming schedule is to present this item to the Board of County
28 Commissioners tomorrow and then get a recommendation on one
29 recommended methodology to finalize and then run the numbers to
30 forward to the subarea planning groups to continue on with their
31 prospective planning processes. Following this, the consultant
32 group will return to finalize and document the methodology together
33 with concluding the rural assessment. The idea is that reasonable
34 measures will be considered as a part of each subarea planning
35 process that determines the need, or not, to expand the UGAs and/or
36 increase densities inside this area. Consultant and CAG attempting
37 to focus on looking on how much people can be accommodated at
38 this point in time. The options and which methodology is up for
39 consensus by the Board of County Commissioners.

40

- 1 • **Vice Chair Mahan – Asked how long it would take to determine**
2 **the numbers once a methodology is selected.**

3
4 **Personious – Once numbers are completed for all methodologies,**
5 **they will be presented to the Planning Commission and Board of**
6 **County Commissioners. Once compiled, they are finished. Using**
7 **numbers from October and once a specific methodology is decided**
8 **on, will do one last run based on the January 2005 input on gross**
9 **vacant, underutilized, concluding with one set of numbers for each**
10 **UGA. Reiterated that the capital facilities planning should occur at**
11 **the subarea planning process level.**

- 12
13 • **Gustavson - suggested fine tuning points for detailed**
14 **spreadsheet thus allowing thus allowing deductions and**
15 **assumptions to show.**

16
17 **Personius – As noted in 1998, land capacity analysis is not an exact**
18 **science, a point understood by the GMHB. The County still needs to**
19 **be more conservative about impact assumptions. It makes it more**
20 **difficult to map relative to mapping parcels a certain distance from**
21 **sewers considered unfeasible today but 20 years from now, the**
22 **target is more difficult to depict. Assumptions are made that this will**
23 **develop but cannot be determined at this time. Hopefully this can be**
24 **fine tuned by the subarea planning process by assigning costs and**
25 **reasonable measures and then determine if public subsidies to fund**
26 **sewers are viable. Currently, this is just a tool to work through the**
27 **process.**

- 28
29 • **Gustavson – Sewering rural schools needs to be satisfied.**

30
31 **Personius – This is one example where ULIDs are feasible and**
32 **warranted due to one property owner (the pertinent school district)**
33 **being willing and financially able to absorb the cost. The completed**
34 **spreadsheets will show a prevalence of small lots in most of the**
35 **UGAs, making it extremely problematic to do ULIDs or developer**
36 **extensions. This issue needs to be addressed.**

- 37
38 • **Jenniges – Asked for the downside of ULIDs.**

39
40 **Personius – There are fragmented small lots, making it difficult to get**
41 **them all to agree to share in the cost to extend sewers.**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

3. Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) Update

Eric Baker - Discussed CAO revisions, noting that staff has held a series of workshops, north, central and south through December and January. This process is approximately two-thirds completed. Various members of the Planning Commission have been in attendance. Central Kitsap is still remaining and is scheduled at the Silverdale Community Center, Evergreen Room, 6-9 PM. The first two workshops were very successful, having good attendance and productive input at both north and south district meetings. Following completion of these group public meetings and written input received, combined with input received since the first public draft was released June, 2004, a second public draft will be prepared to include all public comments. With this document will be a science-supporting document. Baker asked who did not receive the Mackey document referenced earlier by Commissioner Gustavson. Another set will be distributed via US mail to be sure everyone has a chance to review the material. The Best Available Science (BAS) white paper is a summary of the science included in the large binders distributed earlier. Anyone attending the CAO Science Panel held in October is aware of the large amount of information available making up BAS that creates a good range of buffers based on wetland and other critical area documents. These are documented in the White Paper indicating what percentage of certain functions is derived from buffers and other protections. This is only a summary of the literature and does not point to any one direction. The Science support document will do this and should be produced together with the draft CAO, hopefully to be released in early to late February. Following the release, staff will discuss results with the Board of County Commissioners as to what additional public participation should be employed prior to review by the Planning Commission. Staff is still on target for late March to set the first Planning Commission public hearing on the CAO. This is tentative and will depend on any additional public participation selected by the Board and staff between now and then. Staff has a work plan in place that has the CAO completed by the end of April.

- Jenniges – Asked about input on adequate or inadequate buffers.**

1 E. Baker – Excellent turnout at both workshops with a request by
2 certain individuals to vote on whether they felt the critical area
3 revisions are necessary or whether the critical areas protections are
4 currently too stringent already. Although several attendees had left
5 by this time, there were still a large number of citizens who believed
6 that the current regulations are overly restrictive. Staff does not view
7 this as a popular vote but indicative of those people remaining at the
8 end of the meeting.

- 9
- 10 • Gustavson – Made reference to the Mackey document, pages –
11 pages 42-44 addressing the Supreme Court’s decision on
12 buffers in critical areas. Requested copy of the Island County
13 case.** He also expressed interest in the Aloverty case in the
14 City of Camas indicating findings in favor of the developer.
15 Thinks the direction taken to date, does not address the issue
16 of critical areas. Buffers are a major issue of concern and
17 addressed several elements that could qualify for buffer sizing.
18 Thinks a large amount of taxpayers’ money is being expended
19 on this issue.

20

21 E. Baker –The budget factors in a specific amount of money set aside
22 for appeals that are a way of life in today’s world. The second public
23 draft will include staff’s professional, informed and educated opinion
24 on BAS and the necessary protections for fish and wildlife habitat
25 and other critical areas.

- 26
- 27 • Lary Coppola – Since public input is such an important part of
28 the process, and public input was received that did not agree
29 with staff, is this impact data considered?

30

31 E. Baker – Staff is considering all public input equally, not just input
32 that matches the first public draft. That would not accomplish the
33 desired outcome based on all public input. Instead, staff will
34 calculate input on every spectrum and this will become the second
35 public draft. This second public draft will be comprised of staff’s
36 professional, informed, educated opinion on BAS and necessary
37 protections to protect fish and wildlife habitat and other critical
38 areas. E. Baker reiterated that staff will factor in as much public
39 input as possible to compile the second public draft.

40

- 1 • Coppola – Considered E. Baker’s answer to mean that if the
2 public has an opinion that staff does not agree with, it will be
3 considered irrelevant by staff and not included in the second
4 public draft.

5

6 E. Baker - Responded to Coppola that his assumption as just stated
7 is definitely not the case.

8

9 C. Baker – New data is being received and will be presented to the
10 Board of County Commissioners. DCD still needs to make a
11 recommendation based on scientists’ prospective. Reminded the
12 Planning Commission members that staff are governed by GMA
13 requirements that dictates BAS criteria. Since Kitsap County only
14 has a small amount of scientist, it has had to rely on larger
15 jurisdictions with adequate staffing in this area for information on
16 BAS.

17

18 Jim Bolger – Referenced the larger counties; King, Snohomish and
19 Pierce, that are used for BAS information.

20

- 21 • Jenniges – Questioned legalities and the need for DCD staff to
22 discuss with DPAs before pursuing and implementing critical
23 areas regulation to insure that there will not be a legal battle
24 between the County and developers.

25

26 C. Baker – Staff is working with the Prosecutor’s Office.

27

28 J. Bolger – Based on public meetings referenced by Eric Baker, much
29 input has been received by citizens at public meetings and via US
30 mail and email. Some people saying too restrictive and other saying
31 not enough restrictions. Now need to look at a balanced approach.

32

- 33 • Jenniges – Expressed concern as to whether the final decision
34 will hold up under legal scrutiny.

35

36 E. Baker and Bolger – Both assured Planning Commission members
37 that legal review is critical to assure legally defensible decisions.

38

- 39 • Gustavson – Requested a legal briefing for the Planning
40 Commission.

41

1 E. Baker – This could be problematic because of client-attorney
2 privileged information. However, he will approach this matter with
3 the Prosecutor’s civil staff for an opinion. Appeals are a part of
4 Kitsap County’s history and staff works diligently with DPAs to
5 mitigate potential lawsuits.

6
7 C. Baker – Introduced Community Planning/Long Range Planning
8 Division staff.

9
10 4. Port Orchard/South Kitsap Subarea Planning

11
12 James Weaver – Gave described his professional background and
13 expressed a desire to work on the Port Orchard/SK planning process.
14 Originally this was to be a jurisdictional review between the City and
15 Kitsap County through the expansion of the current UGA. During
16 this process, the City and County changed consultants. The firm of
17 EDAW is no longer being used. AHBL replaced EDAW and is
18 dedicating two planners from their firm to work with City and County
19 staff on this subarea plan. There has also been changes made to the
20 Citizens’ Advisory Group (CAG). Lary Coppola is Chair and Bill
21 Palmer is Vice-Chair. Staff is hopeful that this group will be able to
22 move forward and get desired results from the process. The
23 meetings time line has been changed (See Attachment B). CAG
24 meetings have been increased to bi-weekly. Agreement has been
25 reached on a designated study area. Approximately 90% of the CAG
26 reached consensus on this. Planning team is currently reviewing
27 task 3.0, development of land use and SEPA review alternatives.
28 This includes a scoping report to be used as preliminary document
29 for the EIS. This is heavily reliant on Urban Land Capacity Analysis.
30 Data from this analysis will be used to create scoping to move
31 forward with subarea planning as well as to address expressed
32 concerns about implementing capital improvement plans resulting
33 from existing data analyzed under the Urban Land Capacity Analysis.
34 Staff is striving to accommodate the Urban Land Capacity Analysis
35 schedule. Documents and alternatives are being prepared to
36 anticipate and support the chosen methodology. Changes will be
37 necessary throughout the process to accommodate the ultimate
38 methodology decision. Meanwhile, staff is doing everything possible
39 to accommodate all issues of the EIS and the plan that can be
40 accomplished without the calculations. The original time line
41 scheduled review of the draft document in April 2005. A final

1 document is still intended for May and reviewed again in June. Staff
2 hopes to incorporate all goals set for this process and still meet a
3 compressed time line. Next CAG meeting is scheduled for January
4 19th. Public and Board of County Commissioners are welcome to
5 attend. Staff is in the process of preparing documents including
6 public input.

- 7
- 8 • Jenniges – Questioned if the study area will eventually equate
9 to expansion of the UGA.

10
11 J. Weaver – The study area will incorporate all areas to include
12 densities. There may be areas eliminated from the ultimate boundary
13 such as critical areas difficult to develop and areas of rural buffers or
14 separators. Exclusions indicating where growth can be focused, will
15 be identified.

- 16
- 17 • Jenniges – Asked for clarification on definition of study area,
18 thinking it was developed to consider population growth; not
19 commercial but general housing development. However due to
20 the restrictions addressed, not convinced there is enough land
21 to consider.

22
23 J. Weaver – Analysis was conducted indicating growth can be
24 accommodated as allowed under GMA.

- 25
- 26 • Ahl – Questioned statement on having had two major
27 workshops on Port Orchard/South Kitsap Subarea Plan. Does
28 not recall this to be the case.
- 29
- 30 • Gustavson - Understands development projections on east side
31 have been filled. With a potential population increase of one
32 million people coming to the Puget Sound area in the near
33 future, there is little room left to put them. If this is the case,
34 expressed need to revisit the issue.

35
36 J. Weaver –First addressed the population allocation, referencing
37 Greg Easton’s presentation of a report and summary discussing the
38 intended growth due to the Narrows Bridge project and other
39 incentive projects that might increase South Kitsap’s growth. The
40 CAG comments were related to Easton with a directive to
41 accommodate these comments through additional studies and to

1 incorporate additional studies currently being conducted as well as
2 the study being prepared by the State to explain any upwards
3 pressures on upward projections. This can be used as a basis on the
4 Port Orchard/SK Subarea planning project. Staff has responded to
5 concerns of the CAG with the document and revisions to it expected
6 by January 31st. Staff has directed consultant to study this issue and
7 calculate any impact.

8
9 C. Baker – in the CPPs, language states that within five years
10 progress will be analyzed relative to an urban and rural split and to
11 population volume as a whole. In five years, the County will review
12 and adjust for any additional population. Because the County did not
13 use the maximum OFM numbers, this matter will come back to the
14 subarea plans to be adjusted.

15
16 J. Bolger – Presented update on the Silverdale Subarea planning
17 process as part of the Comp Plan amendment docket for 2006.
18 Bolger explained process including a different approach that
19 incorporates a watershed analysis. There is grant funding to support
20 this component, similar to the technique used in the Chico
21 Watershed process. This allows for natural resource based modeling
22 and helps inform developers about alternatives based on how a
23 subarea plan may look in the future. He introduced the staff planning
24 team involved in this particular subarea plan along with him; Angie
25 Silva, Paul Nelson, and potentially a new senior planner. Paul Nelson
26 will be responsible for the watershed analysis component on this
27 project. A resource team including Silverdale Water will analyze
28 potential water availability for future growth. Consults include Jones
29 & Stocks, Kaspersin Pettinari, a design firm to develop design
30 guidelines specifically to the existing UGA. the Citizen Advisory
31 Committee (CAC) has held three meetings to date. It is a large group
32 consisting of 39 members. Silverdale has been the focus of many
33 studies in past years. Through the current subarea planning
34 process, staff and consultants are hoping to compile the best of
35 these plans that can be accomplished on the 20 year planning
36 horizon. Most plans have a five-year review schedule to keep on
37 track with the latest analysis. The CAC meets bi-monthly and breaks
38 into sub-committee structure. One is a Watershed Analysis sub-
39 committee that will be working with Paul Nelson to develop
40 alternative land use scenarios then following through with the
41 mapping. Another sub-committee is the Urban Design Sub-

1 **Committee. Both sub-committees will be responsible for major**
2 **specificity on assigned issues to bring back identified**
3 **recommendations to the CAC for decision, coordination and update.**
4 **Also, the CAG is coordinating closely with the CKCC, attending its**
5 **meetings and several of its members also serve on the Subarea CAC.**
6 **Progress includes defining the study area for the Silverdale Subarea**
7 **Plan that will become the envelope within which the UGAs and**
8 **possible expansions will take place. Bolger referenced on map the**
9 **proposed boundaries and responded to questions from Planning**
10 **Commission members with reference to roads. Bolger further**
11 **described the new study area that will probably go south to Chico**
12 **and north to Brownsville then down to the Mosher Creek area.**
13 **East/West is Hood Canal and Puget Sound. He then discussed**
14 **infrastructure (sewer/water) details. He noted on the map the specific**
15 **boundaries of the watershed areas and criteria used for modeling.**
16 **One consideration when viewing the envelope for this particular**
17 **study area was to take the most generous reduction factors to**
18 **achieve an estimate for population allocation, followed by a**
19 **determination of what type of area is needed to accommodate the**
20 **population allocation. Thus as part of the exercise to define the**
21 **boundaries for the study area, the CAC worked with approximately**
22 **8,000 people and roughly 1,000 acres. Associated with this particular**
23 **UGA there are Urban Reserve Area that are priority growth areas**
24 **identified in a Vision 2052 Plan that the CKCC developed in 2002.**
25 **The Council based the priority expansion areas on whether current**
26 **services still exist, densities, relative distance to existing services,**
27 **etc. Watershed analysis aspects of this subarea plan, looks at the**
28 **watersheds that run from Chico Watershed through major drainages**
29 **in the area down to Mosher Creek and include all watersheds in**
30 **between. The watershed analysis is a technique that includes**
31 **working with a team of modelers to assist sub-committees to**
32 **produce land use scenarios. Following this, the modelers will run the**
33 **land use scenarios through their various models to indicate what**
34 **would happen under particular scenarios. The sub-committees can**
35 **then make decisions based on the outcome of the models. This**
36 **allows the committees to analyze the “What If’s” relative to**
37 **watershed functions. It takes more time on the front end but**
38 **provides more information for the Committee to use when actually**
39 **deciding on how to accommodate growth and development into the**
40 **future. Hopefully, this will identify areas where development can take**
41 **place and not impact natural resources. In the process, much**

1 analysis will have taken place associated with the alternatives
2 associated with the EIS or SEPA process for the subarea plans. The
3 Silverdale Subarea planning process will be working closely with
4 Silverdale Water to determine its capacity and availability or amount
5 of water resources now and in the future. In response to a question
6 from a Planning Commission, all State, Federal and Tribal members
7 have been kept off CAC but their input will be accepted separately.
8 Meetings with these groups will be held quarterly with comments
9 relayed back to the CAC.

- 10
- 11 • Ahl – Asked if there were any suggestions to connect Silverdale
12 to the East Bremerton UGA.
 - 13
 - 14 • Vice Chair Mahan – Based on major traffic problems already in
15 Silverdale, hoping transportation component will be brought in
16 early on in the process and that Public Works will play a major
17 part.
 - 18

19 Keri Weaver, Project Manager for both Kingston Phase II and
20 Suquamish - Explained that her two projects are updates to existing
21 plans, not new subareas and therefore not nearly as complex as the
22 other subarea plans discussed here today. The Kingston Subarea
23 Plan is currently undergoing an update of a new plan approved by
24 the Board of County Commissioners in 2003. The current Plan was
25 originally based on an interim population allocation of 640 people.
26 The 2025 population allocation had not been completed yet so a best
27 available guess was used taking the population out to 2017. It was
28 decided that when the final numbers became available, it would then
29 be determined whether or not to expand the UGA. We now have a
30 final 2025 allocation to Kingston of an additional 3135 people to
31 accommodate. Again, Phase II is a short-term update, already having
32 the original base information to work with and staff is only
33 considering the additional population. This will involve an EIS
34 addendum based on the existing information plus an updated staff
35 report. A major item the Citizen Advisory Group and staff is
36 reviewing is the Arborwood development or the Arborwood vested
37 application, a large parcel of property to the southwest of the existing
38 Kingston UGA. It is comprised of approximately 250 acres, reduced
39 down from the original 700 acres. The reduction has been
40 accomplished through some land purchases with the County and
41 some additional rezones. Another smaller parcel being considered is

1 the White-Luke 20 acre site specific rezone request that the Board
2 deferred to this Phase II planning process from a 2004 site specific
3 application. To date, the CAG has met only once. Currently, it is
4 waiting for the outcome of the Urban Land Capacity Analysis for the
5 finalization of the methodology and the data. This information will
6 indicate if the UGA needs expanding and once the numbers are
7 ready, the process should move ahead fairly quickly. Staff will also
8 be updating reasonable measures in the Kingston Plan as well as
9 design standards. Andy Bergsagel has been assigned this project.
10 He has submitted a draft to the CAG. The Kingston Citizen Advisory
11 Committee (KCAC) has been working on a new item, that is the
12 development of a draft Parks and Trails Plan. Staff is hoping to have
13 a draft Kingston Phase II Plan ready for public review by June or July
14 of this year. A public open house was held in December of 2004 to
15 familiarize the public with the Plan update and another one is
16 tentatively planned this spring once the numbers are ready and staff
17 can present more specificity to the citizens. The next CAG meeting is
18 scheduled for next week where discussion will focus on water
19 availability and water right. A very good panel of speakers is
20 scheduled that will hopefully stimulate some meaningful dialogue
21 since North Kitsap will have major water impacts in coming years.
22 Staff has already heard from North Kitsap Fire and Rescue with
23 concerns over provision of fire flow in currently existing
24 developments. The following meeting will focus on the reasonable
25 measures issue. A consultant, Eric Towes with Cascadia of Port
26 Townsend, is under contract to work on the EIS addendum and the
27 response to public input on that process. Staff will introduce him to
28 the Planning Commission in the near future.

- 29
- 30 • Tom Nevins – First asked for the current population of Kingston
31 and its UGA and then asked for an explanation of the methodology
32 used to arrive at the population allocation for a subarea plan.

33

34 K. Weaver – Responded as follows: 1) When the Kingston UGA was
35 approved the 2000 base line population available was 1,871. When
36 the Subarea Plan was approved in 2003, an additional interim
37 allocation of 640 was given and added on to the original 1,871.
38 Currently, another 3,135 is being allocated and these three numbers
39 added together will be the number used for 2025, (5,646).

40

1 C. Baker – As to how these numbers are derived or the methodology
2 used, Travis Black, the County’s Demographer, allocates population
3 to various areas based on specific criteria using potential growth
4 patterns. The cities began by specifying a number to the County as
5 to how much population they thought they could accommodate.
6 Kingston is unincorporated so the County calculated the analysis for
7 this area based on OFM numbers left over after incorporated cities
8 had theirs.

- 9
- 10 • Ahl – Asked for a map showing the numbers for each region of
11 County. He wants to see where allocations are located.**

12

13 C. Baker – The numbers are hard for all areas except Port Orchard
14 that has the ability to adjust to their needs. Every other area is given
15 hard numbers. Port Orchard was not able to give the County a
16 bottom’s up approach so they were allowed to adjust accordingly.
17 Cindy will ask Travis Black to come to the next meeting and present
18 the level of detail the Planning Commission members are looking
19 for.** (Travis’ attendance at February 8, 2005 Planning Commission
20 meeting is confirmed)

21

22 K. Weaver – Suquamish is undergoing a five–year update at this time.
23 Like Kingston, Suquamish is not a subarea plan; it is a LAMIRD.
24 When the Board of County Commissioners approved the Suquamish
25 Subarea Plan in 1999, it intended to limit growth rather than plan for
26 growth. The LAMIRD is a permanent boundary around the village of
27 Suquamish. The approved plan is fairly limited. It established
28 certain Suquamish-specific zoning requirements on certain
29 development standards and established community goals and
30 policies to achieve improvements to the area particularly for re-
31 development purposes. The goal is to review and make necessary
32 updates every five years. This is the point in time staff is at now and
33 are in the process of analyzing changes to current conditions,
34 circumstances, community desires, omissions from previous plans
35 and to address any changes to the GMA or other legal requirements
36 that need to be incorporated. Also under review are successes
37 and/or failures of the 1999 Plan, specifically goals, objectives and
38 policies. There will always be some that were not properly
39 addressed and need to be added to the current work plan for
40 improvement. Andy Bergsagel will also be working on design
41 standards for Suquamish as well as Kingston, especially in the

1 downtown area. By working with the Suquamish work group of
2 interested citizens, staff is hoping to achieve some zoning changes
3 with the goal of potential development in the downtown area. The
4 community has identified several major issues they want addressed.
5 These include: pedestrian safety and facilities, bicycle facilities,
6 trails and open space, wastewater facility and services and
7 transportation/transit issues. Sub-committees have been formed to
8 study each of these issues after which they will report back to the
9 main work group with their findings for potential incorporation into
10 the Plan. Two important items mentioned by the work group that
11 they wish to have addressed in this update are: 1) greater tribal
12 coordination with the Suquamish Tribe; and 2) better communication
13 with the County. As with Kingston, this is also on schedule for the
14 2005 Comp Plan Amendment docket and completion is anticipated by
15 June or July of this year. Staff is hoping to also have a public open
16 house on this plan as well as Kingston sometime this spring, April or
17 May with a draft document ready for public review at the same time.
18 The next work group meeting is next week. Focus will be on bicycle
19 facilities. The community wants to attract more bicycle tourism
20 including biking festivals. The following meeting will focus mostly
21 on sub-committee findings and recommendations.

- 22
- 23 • Ahl – Asked about the level of public participation.

24

25 K. Weaver – Not as good as Kingston. History shows it to be more
26 difficult to draw people out in Suquamish. It appears that more
27 people are coming out at each meeting and she is pleased with the
28 level of Tribal involvement, including three Tribal members on the
29 work group.

- 30
- 31 • Taylor – asked for status on lifting of burn ban for a period in the
32 spring and fall. Also mentioned that the Planning Commission
33 was promised that the 9-lot short plat update would be before the
34 Planning Commission last November. Jim Bolger will ask that
35 additional information on these two issues will be presented at the
36 next Planning Commission meeting.** He then expressed
37 appreciation to staff for updates and for keeping things moving.

38

39 E. Old Business

40

41 None

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

F. New Business

None

G. Other Business

None

11:40 AM - No further business being heard, a motion was made by Lary Coppola and second by Tom Nevins that the meeting be adjourned. Motion carried.

Exhibit No. Description

- A. January 11, 2005 Agenda
- B. PowerPoint Presentation on Urban Land Capacity Analysis (Attachment A)
- C. ULCA Updated Alternative Methodologies - Draft
- D. Port Orchard/SK Subarea Planning Update materials packet – (Attachment B)
- E. Silverdale Subarea Planning Update materials packet
- F. Kingston Plan Review Update materials packet
- G. Suquamish Plan Review Update materials packet
- H. Break-out Critical Area Questionnaire
- I. A Summary of Best Available Science Review Draft December 2004
- J. Best Scientific and Commercially Available Information – Getting Back to the Garden by J.W. Buell, Ph.D. – Submitted by Commissioner Gustavson
- K. Planning Commissioners Journal – Fall 2004

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2005.

Mark Flynn, Chair

1

2

Holly Anderson, Planning Commission Secretary