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.
D. WORK / STUDY SESSION

1, DCD update

Cindy Baker, Department of Community Development Director

- Thanked the Planning Commission for attending the holiday luncheon prepared for them by staff members.
- Thanked staff for their efforts in making the luncheon a success.
- Complimented the Long Range Planning staff for their hard work during difficult times and staffing changes. Jim Bolger is covering the position of Community Planning Division Manager on an interim basis until vacant positions are filled. Currently Community Planning staff is four positions short, with an overall vacancy situation of 11 positions total in the department. Additionally, five employees have had surgery recently and were or are still absent for over six weeks each.
- Introduced Mark Personius, consultant for Updated Land Capacity Analysis and listed the various tasks Mark has contracted to perform for Kitsap County. Personius and staff are getting close to completion on this project. Once completed, the information will be forwarded to the subarea planning teams to review the UGAs and reasonable measures and to determine if an expansion of UGAs is warranted.
- Subarea Plans will be addressed and updated today. Staff will define problem areas within the planning process and resolve them. These decisions are made with much analysis.
- Although not an issue that will come before the Planning Commission, the Fire Code is almost completed.
- Permit numbers have increased from last year.
- Major issues needing resolution last April are about to come to fruition.
- Asked for questions on overall programs for the Department.
- Announcements are out to fill vacant positions. The message should be disseminated that these postings can be found on the County’s website. Have a couple leads for possible temporary relief.
- Introduced the Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) issue. Explained background of committee set up by former DCD
Director Kamuron Gurol, noting there is a wide range of opinions. C. Baker needed to familiarize herself with the subject and spent time listening and asking questions. In order to proceed forward, the Committee agreed to focus on solutions by coming up with different options on analysis. Using 1998 as standard methodology, the group agreed to tweak some of the assumptions, ending up with various options. Not intending to select only one, will instead present options as a whole. Will ask for concurrence with assumptions made in the analysis. Most important is for basis to be strong with substance prior to coming up with the numbers. This avoids perception or preconceived notions that attempts are being made to end up with an already selected number. Baker expressed excitement about process and asked for feedback from the Planning Commission members. Staff remains open to change.

2. Urban Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) Update

Mark Personius – Presented a PowerPoint overview of the ULCA process to date (See Attachment A) and distributed a more in-depth, detailed explanation of the methodology options, assumptions and some discussions amongst member of the Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) over the past three months. This information will also be presented to the Board of County Commissioners at tomorrow’s work/study session. This analysis lists five alternative methodologies: 1998 County Comp Plan Methodology; 2002 Buildable Lands Analysis Methodology; Option #1-2004 Methodology; Option #2-2004 Methodology; and Option #3- Byron Harris/Prudential Real Estate’s Methodology. They are preparing their own Land Capacity Analysis. This in-depth analysis shows that the 2004 methodology utilizes the GIS database to quantify actual critical areas and their buffers. These are based on the currently adopted CAO. Personious explained specific criteria under the CAO relative to buffers and density transfer. For the PowerPoint presentation, Personius explained each topic listed on slide No. 1, ULCA Criteria (Reduction Factor Assumptions) before proceeding to highlight each topic with further explanation based on assumptions and methodologies, (See Attachment A, slides 3-12). These include: 1) Total gross acreage-(vacant and underutilized land). ADUs are excluded from this analysis; 2) Re-developable underutilized land. Small, shoreline parcels of less than one acre in size are excluded
from analysis; 3) Critical areas. This involves deducting critical areas from the net available vacant and re-developable and underutilized lands; and 4) Infrastructure constraints. This is an area authorized by the State’s Buildable Lands guidelines but has not been utilized to date. The idea was to identify lands infeasible for sewer extension at this time. Purveyors maintain they can accommodate current growth however many extenuating circumstances could lead to infeasibility. At the same time, 20 years of land capacity analysis must be considered in that over time, the lines will be extended. When this happens, the land capacity analysis will change. This is complicated by the lack of a detailed sewer study to provide information on parcel-by-parcel analysis. This issue took that most discussion time of any issue before the CAG because of the impact on land capacity and the inevitable change. The last component of this analysis was to exclude sewer constraint from any Urban Restricted zone (1-5 units per acre), typically heavily impacted by critical areas. Lastly, not proposing to place constraint on water availability although this could become issue in the future; 5) Roads/ROW (future). Recommended under option 1 is an increase the reduction factor from 1998’s 17% to 20% based on considerations from Public Works Department and Developmental Engineering Division of DCD. Approved plats are showing increasing amounts of land devoted to roads and parking in driveways; 6) Public facilities (future) other than roads. It is recommended to maintain a 15% reduction factor, same as used in 1998 and the Buildable Lands Analysis; 7) Unavailable lands. This is considered by many to be a market factor, looking again at vacant land unavailable for development due to landowner or legal constraints. In 2004, a lower reduction factor than used in 1998, is suggested based on added infrastructure constrain not considered in 1998. Could not find where any unavailable land factor methodology was used in 2002 Buildable Lands report. Lastly, once a net available vacant and underutilized lands count is determined, a population capacity will be available to compare with the future 20-year allocation to make the assumption whether or not there is enough room within existing UGAs or if further action is required. Based on the Board’s desires, Personious and staff are now ready to run the numbers to see how far apart they are; and 8) Person per dwelling unit.
Personius - Defined Underutilized lands as any developed parcels that can accommodate additional development based on their current zoning. He also noted differences between previous assumptions used and those used currently. Overriding all of this is the goal to try and get a better sense of reality into the methodology with less reliance on assumptions made in other jurisdictions and communities; data that either could not be accurately verified locally or that data locally is more accurate. Goal has always been to find the best data locally. The outcome hoped for is data that will determine lands likely to redevelop in the next 20 years. To accomplish this, spreadsheets will be prepared for every UGA that, when completed, every assumption will depict how many units will fall into a category. In other words, if you change the assumption, the number of re-developable lands will also change. He concluded (Slide 13) by noting: Established assumptions without knowing outcome; Schedule; Reasonable measures during Subarea planning; Where to go from here, using one option or combination.

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

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

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

- Gustavson - Questioned roads vs. access to new construction.

C. Baker – Consultant and staff are looking at growth connectivity.
Ahl – Expressed concern that because military families are included in the census figures, yet on-base housing assets numbering in the thousands are not, any estimates of housing shortfalls in the County would be distorted. In other words, it is troubling that the County’s inventory of available housing is not sufficient to accommodate the number of people living in Kitsap County because the inventory does not include Government owned housing.

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

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

Gustavson – Need to get the accumulative aspect into the calculations.

Personius – GIS is compiling the aforementioned spreadsheets where every line will show deductions and assumptions. When ultimately completed, the gross number can be inserted and the output net number to come up with the ultimate reduction factor. The upcoming schedule is to present this item to the Board of County Commissioners tomorrow and then get a recommendation on one recommended methodology to finalize and then run the numbers to forward to the subarea planning groups to continue on with their prospective planning processes. Following this, the consultant group will return to finalize and document the methodology together with concluding the rural assessment. The idea is that reasonable measures will be considered as a part of each subarea planning process that determines the need, or not, to expand the UGAs and/or increase densities inside this area. Consultant and CAG attempting to focus on looking on how much people can be accommodated at this point in time. The options and which methodology is up for consensus by the Board of County Commissioners.
• Vice Chair Mahan – Asked how long it would take to determine
  the numbers once a methodology is selected.

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

• Gustavson - suggested fine tuning points for detailed
  spreadsheet thus allowing thus allowing deductions and
  assumptions to show.

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

• Gustavson – Sewering rural schools needs to be satisfied.

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

• Jenniges – Asked for the downside of ULIDs.

Personius – There are fragmented small lots, making it difficult to get
them all to agree to share in the cost to extend sewers.
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.
E. Baker – Excellent turnout at both workshops with a request by certain individuals to vote on whether they felt the critical area revisions are necessary or whether the critical areas protections are currently too stringent already. Although several attendees had left by this time, there were still a large number of citizens who believed that the current regulations are overly restrictive. Staff does not view this as a popular vote but indicative of those people remaining at the end of the meeting.

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

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

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

E. Baker – Staff is considering all public input equally, not just input that matches the first public draft. That would not accomplish the desired outcome based on all public input. Instead, staff will calculate input on every spectrum and this will become the second public draft. This second public draft will be comprised of staff’s professional, informed, educated opinion on BAS and necessary protections to protect fish and wildlife habitat and other critical areas. E. Baker reiterated that staff will factor in as much public input as possible to compile the second public draft.
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- Coppola – Considered E. Baker’s answer to mean that if the public has an opinion that staff does not agree with, it will be considered irrelevant by staff and not included in the second public draft.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. Port Orchard/South Kitsap Subarea Planning

James Weaver – Gave described his professional background and expressed a desire to work on the Port Orchard/SK planning process. Originally this was to be a jurisdictional review between the City and Kitsap County through the expansion of the current UGA. During this process, the City and County changed consultants. The firm of EDAW is no longer being used. AHBL replaced EDAW and is dedicating two planners from their firm to work with City and County staff on this subarea plan. There has also been changes made to the Citizens’ Advisory Group (CAG). Lary Coppola is Chair and Bill Palmer is Vice-Chair. Staff is hopeful that this group will be able to move forward and get desired results from the process. The meetings time line has been changed (See Attachment B). CAG meetings have been increased to bi-weekly. Agreement has been reached on a designated study area. Approximately 90% of the CAG reached consensus on this. Planning team is currently reviewing task 3.0, development of land use and SEPA review alternatives. This includes a scoping report to be used as preliminary document for the EIS. This is heavily reliant on Urban Land Capacity Analysis. Data from this analysis will be used to create scoping to move forward with subarea planning as well as to address expressed concerns about implementing capital improvement plans resulting from existing data analyzed under the Urban Land Capacity Analysis. Staff is striving to accommodate the Urban Land Capacity Analysis schedule. Documents and alternatives are being prepared to anticipate and support the chosen methodology. Changes will be necessary throughout the process to accommodate the ultimate methodology decision. Meanwhile, staff is doing everything possible to accommodate all issues of the EIS and the plan that can be accomplished without the calculations. The original time line scheduled review of the draft document in April 2005. A final
document is still intended for May and reviewed again in June. Staff hopes to incorporate all goals set for this process and still meet a compressed time line. Next CAG meeting is scheduled for January 19th. Public and Board of County Commissioners are welcome to attend. Staff is in the process of preparing documents including public input.

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

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

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

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

- Ahl – Questioned statement on having had two major workshops on Port Orchard/South Kitsap Subarea Plan. Does not recall this to be the case.

- Gustavson - Understands development projections on east side have been filled. With a potential population increase of one million people coming to the Puget Sound area in the near future, there is little room left to put them. If this is the case, expressed need to revisit the issue.

J. Weaver – First addressed the population allocation, referencing Greg Easton’s presentation of a report and summary discussing the intended growth due to the Narrows Bridge project and other incentive projects that might increase South Kitsap’s growth. The CAG comments were related to Easton with a directive to accommodate these comments through additional studies and to
incorporate additional studies currently being conducted as well as the study being prepared by the State to explain any upwards pressures on upward projections. This can be used as a basis on the Port Orchard/SK Subarea planning project. Staff has responded to concerns of the CAG with the document and revisions to it expected by January 31st. Staff has directed consultant to study this issue and calculate any impact.

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

J. Bolger – Presented update on the Silverdale Subarea planning process as part of the Comp Plan amendment docket for 2006. Bolger explained process including a different approach that incorporates a watershed analysis. There is grant funding to support this component, similar to the technique used in the Chico Watershed process. This allows for natural resource based modeling and helps inform developers about alternatives based on how a subarea plan may look in the future. He introduced the staff planning team involved in this particular subarea plan along with him; Angie Silva, Paul Nelson, and potentially a new senior planner. Paul Nelson will be responsible for the watershed analysis component on this project. A resource team including Silverdale Water will analyze potential water availability for future growth. Consults include Jones & Stocks, Kaspersin Pettinari, a design firm to develop design guidelines specifically to the existing UGA. the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) has held three meetings to date. It is a large group consisting of 39 members. Silverdale has been the focus of many studies in past years. Through the current subarea planning process, staff and consultants are hoping to compile the best of these plans that can be accomplished on the 20 year planning horizon. Most plans have a five-year review schedule to keep on track with the latest analysis. The CAC meets bi-monthly and breaks into sub-committee structure. One is a Watershed Analysis sub-committee that will be working with Paul Nelson to develop alternative land use scenarios then following through with the mapping. Another sub-committee is the Urban Design Sub-
Committee. Both sub-committees will be responsible for major specificity on assigned issues to bring back identified recommendations to the CAC for decision, coordination and update. Also, the CAG is coordinating closely with the CKCC, attending its meetings and several of its members also serve on the Subarea CAC. Progress includes defining the study area for the Silverdale Subarea Plan that will become the envelope within which the UGAs and possible expansions will take place. Bolger referenced on map the proposed boundaries and responded to questions from Planning Commission members with reference to roads. Bolger further described the new study area that will probably go south to Chico and north to Brownsville then down to the Mosher Creek area. East/West is Hood Canal and Puget Sound. He then discussed infrastructure (sewer/water) details. He noted on the map the specific boundaries of the watershed areas and criteria used for modeling. One consideration when viewing the envelope for this particular study area was to take the most generous reduction factors to achieve an estimate for population allocation, followed by a determination of what type of area is needed to accommodate the population allocation. Thus as part of the exercise to define the boundaries for the study area, the CAC worked with approximately 8,000 people and roughly 1,000 acres. Associated with this particular UGA there are Urban Reserve Area that are priority growth areas identified in a Vision 2052 Plan that the CKCC developed in 2002. The Council based the priority expansion areas on whether current services still exist, densities, relative distance to existing services, etc. Watershed analysis aspects of this subarea plan, looks at the watersheds that run from Chico Watershed through major drainages in the area down to Mosher Creek and include all watersheds in between. The watershed analysis is a technique that includes working with a team of modelers to assist sub-committees to produce land use scenarios. Following this, the modelers will run the land use scenarios through their various models to indicate what would happen under particular scenarios. The sub-committees can then make decisions based on the outcome of the models. This allows the committees to analyze the “What If’s” relative to watershed functions. It takes more time on the front end but provides more information for the Committee to use when actually deciding on how to accommodate growth and development into the future. Hopefully, this will identify areas where development can take place and not impact natural resources. In the process, much
analysis will have taken place associated with the alternatives associated with the EIS or SEPA process for the subarea plans. The Silverdale Subarea planning process will be working closely with Silverdale Water to determine its capacity and availability or amount of water resources now and in the future. In response to a question from a Planning Commission, all State, Federal and Tribal members have been kept off CAC but their input will be accepted separately. Meetings with these groups will be held quarterly with comments relayed back to the CAC.

- Ahl – Asked if there were any suggestions to connect Silverdale to the East Bremerton UGA.

- Vice Chair Mahan – Based on major traffic problems already in Silverdale, hoping transportation component will be brought in early on in the process and that Public Works will play a major part.

Keri Weaver, Project Manager for both Kingston Phase II and Suquamish - Explained that her two projects are updates to existing plans, not new subareas and therefore not nearly as complex as the other subarea plans discussed here today. The Kingston Subarea Plan is currently undergoing an update of a new plan approved by the Board of County Commissioners in 2003. The current Plan was originally based on an interim population allocation of 640 people. The 2025 population allocation had not been completed yet so a best available guess was used taking the population out to 2017. It was decided that when the final numbers became available, it would then be determined whether or not to expand the UGA. We now have a final 2025 allocation to Kingston of an additional 3135 people to accommodate. Again, Phase II is a short-term update, already having the original base information to work with and staff is only considering the additional population. This will involve an EIS addendum based on the existing information plus an updated staff report. A major item the Citizen Advisory Group and staff is reviewing is the Arborwood development or the Arborwood vested application, a large parcel of property to the southwest of the existing Kingston UGA. It is comprised of approximately 250 acres, reduced down from the original 700 acres. The reduction has been accomplished through some land purchases with the County and some additional rezones. Another smaller parcel being considered is
the White-Luke 20 acre site specific rezone request that the Board
defered to this Phase II planning process from a 2004 site specific
application. To date, the CAG has met only once. Currently, it is
waiting for the outcome of the Urban Land Capacity Analysis for the
finalization of the methodology and the data. This information will
indicate if the UGA needs expanding and once the numbers are
ready, the process should move ahead fairly quickly. Staff will also
be updating reasonable measures in the Kingston Plan as well as
design standards. Andy Bergsagel has been assigned this project.
He has submitted a draft to the CAG. The Kingston Citizen Advisory
Committee (KCAC) has been working on a new item, that is the
development of a draft Parks and Trails Plan. Staff is hoping to have
a draft Kingston Phase II Plan ready for public review by June or July
of this year. A public open house was held in December of 2004 to
familiarize the public with the Plan update and another one is
tentatively planned this spring once the numbers are ready and staff
can present more specificity to the citizens. The next CAG meeting is
scheduled for next week where discussion will focus on water
availability and water right. A very good panel of speakers is
scheduled that will hopefully stimulate some meaningful dialogue
since North Kitsap will have major water impacts in coming years.
Staff has already heard from North Kitsap Fire and Rescue with
concerns over provision of fire flow in currently existing
developments. The following meeting will focus on the reasonable
measures issue. A consultant, Eric Towes with Cascadia of Port
Townsend, is under contract to work on the EIS addendum and the
response to public input on that process. Staff will introduce him to
the Planning Commission in the near future.

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

K. Weaver – Responded as follows: 1) When the Kingston UGA was
approved the 2000 base line population available was 1,871. When
the Subarea Plan was approved in 2003, an additional interim
allocation of 640 was given and added on to the original 1,871.
Currently, another 3,135 is being allocated and these three numbers
added together will be the number used for 2025, (5,646).
C. Baker – As to how these numbers are derived or the methodology used, Travis Black, the County’s Demographer, allocates population to various areas based on specific criteria using potential growth patterns. The cities began by specifying a number to the County as to how much population they thought they could accommodate. Kingston is unincorporated so the County calculated the analysis for this area based on OFM numbers left over after incorporated cities had theirs.

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

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

K. Weaver – Suquamish is undergoing a five–year update at this time. Like Kingston, Suquamish is not a subarea plan; it is a LAMIRD. When the Board of County Commissioners approved the Suquamish Subarea Plan in 1999, it intended to limit growth rather than plan for growth. The LAMIRD is a permanent boundary around the village of Suquamish. The approved plan is fairly limited. It established certain Suquamish-specific zoning requirements on certain development standards and established community goals and policies to achieve improvements to the area particularly for re-development purposes. The goal is to review and make necessary updates every five years. This is the point in time staff is at now and are in the process of analyzing changes to current conditions, circumstances, community desires, omissions from previous plans and to address any changes to the GMA or other legal requirements that need to be incorporated. Also under review are successes and/or failures of the 1999 Plan, specifically goals, objectives and policies. There will always be some that were not properly addressed and need to be added to the current work plan for improvement. Andy Bergsagel will also be working on design standards for Suquamish as well as Kingston, especially in the
downtown area. By working with the Suquamish work group of interested citizens, staff is hoping to achieve some zoning changes with the goal of potential development in the downtown area. The community has identified several major issues they want addressed. These include: pedestrian safety and facilities, bicycle facilities, trails and open space, wastewater facility and services and transportation/transit issues. Sub-committees have been formed to study each of these issues after which they will report back to the main work group with their findings for potential incorporation into the Plan. Two important items mentioned by the work group that they wish to have addressed in this update are: 1) greater tribal coordination with the Suquamish Tribe; and 2) better communication with the County. As with Kingston, this is also on schedule for the 2005 Comp Plan Amendment docket and completion is anticipated by June or July of this year. Staff is hoping to also have a public open house on this plan as well as Kingston sometime this spring, April or May with a draft document ready for public review at the same time. The next work group meeting is next week. Focus will be on bicycle facilities. The community wants to attract more bicycle tourism including biking festivals. The following meeting will focus mostly on sub-committee findings and recommendations.

- Ahl – Asked about the level of public participation.

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

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

E. Old Business

None
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 Questionaire
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
Holly Anderson, Planning Commission Secretary