

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

Work/Study Session

February 28, 2006

1
2
3
4
5
6 **The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated**
7 **date at the Kitsap County Fairgrounds, Eagle’s Nest Conference**
8 **Center, 1195 Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311. Members**
9 **Present: John Ahl, Tom Nevins, Brian Bekeny, John Taylor, Lary**
10 **Coppola, Mike Gustavson, Monty Mahan and Chair, Deb Flynn. Not**
11 **Present: Dean Jenniges. Staff Present: Scott Diener, Jim Rogers,**
12 **Greg Cioc, Linda Bentley, Eric Baker, Angie Silva, Katrina Knutson,**
13 **and Planning Commission Secretary, Brynan Pierce.**

14
15 **9:00 AM**

16
17 **A. Vice Chair John Taylor called the meeting to Order and**
18 **introduced the Planning Commission members present.**

19
20 **Scott Diener-Katrina Knutson and Linda Bentley, Community**
21 **Development’s new staff, and asked them to give some background**
22 **information about themselves.**

23
24 **Linda Bentley-Is happy to be working with DCD. Most of Bentley’s**
25 **experience is with Long Range Planning. Bentley has previously**
26 **worked with the City of Covington, the City of Monroe, Normandy**
27 **Park, and Pierce County.**

28
29 **Katrina Knutson-Is very excited to start her Planning career with**
30 **Kitsap County. Knutson recently graduated from the University of**
31 **Washington with a Bachelor in Community and Environmental**
32 **Planning and a minor in Urban Design and Planning. Knutson**
33 **interned for Seattle Parks and Recreation, People for Puget Sound,**
34 **and Friends of Pierce County.**

35
36 **Diener-Is excited to have both Planners. Diner informed the Planning**
37 **Commission that they have the Planning Commissioner’s Journal in**
38 **front of them. The journal highlights a number of approaches and**
39 **ideas from around the Country that the Commission may not know**
40 **about. If anyone does not find the journal valuable or to their liking,**
41 **please let staff know.**

Approval of Minutes

B. January 24, 2006

A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by Brian Bekey that the Planning Commission minutes of January 24, 2006 be approved. THE VOTE: Yes-6 No-0 Abstained-2. Motion carried.

- Mike Gustavson-Noted that some of the previous minutes do not read smoothly, and to be aware because they are an official part of the record.

Chair Flynn arrived.

Open Space

Rick Fackler-Noted that he met with the Planning Commission January 10, 2006. Since that time, there have been 25 public meetings. Over 50 different user groups were met with including trail users, ball field users, disk golf users, off leash dog proponents, off road vehicle recreationalists and many more. The facility providers have also been met with to identify the needs of the users and how they could be met by the various providers in the County. The last time Fackler met with the Planning Commissioner's one had asked for a cost use analysis for trails. Fackler does not pretend to be an economist, and is not an experienced web researcher but he was provided with web sites and called the City of Seattle, King County and the City of Bellingham trying to get information. In that quest Fackler was unable to find a cost use analysis of trails or other recreational facilities. There was a lot of cost benefit analysis, looking at economic impact of having trails, the impact of developing trails on real estate values. Almost universally, there was a net of positive economic return from the development of trails. The cost of trails varies. They can cost 1 million dollars a mile if it is in an urban area. If they are being built like Tex Lewis or the Hansville Greenway group, with volunteers and donated materials, you can build very inexpensive trails. Determining the cost of trails on an average basis is not easy. In terms of people using trails, there is not a lot of data on. There are studies that take place every five years in May; use is measured of the Berg Gilman trail. The use of the trail has increased

1 and decreased since the 1980's. There are very few trails in Kitsap
2 County and it is hard to know what kind of use they would receive.
3 The e kind of use they would receive. The experience is that once
4 trail networks are in, use increases. Fackler worked for the City of
5 Bellingham's Parks Department for 20 years. There was an extensive
6 trail network developed which became the most popular recreational
7 activity. There was a random survey sent to 4,000 people in Kitsap
8 County in regards to the Open Space Plan. With 1100 responses,
9 walking for pleasure was the recreational activity people currently do
10 and the activity people would do with more facilities. Fackler cannot
11 answer the question about the cost to use analysis, but it is proven
12 that trails can be created fairly inexpensively. There are public
13 meetings held all week in North, Central and South Kitsap. At those
14 meetings, Fackler will be presenting what has been learned at the
15 focus groups, the needs of various users, how to meet the needs,
16 and the responsibilities.

- 17
- 18 • Chair Flynn-Asked if there is going to be an opportunity for
19 public input.

20

21 Fackler- Stated yes, always. There are also weekly meeting notes
22 from each of the focus groups. It has been a very open process.
23 There is a deadline of June 1st where the plan and a copy of the
24 resolution by the Board adopting the plan has to be submitted to the
25 state. Both the Park Board and the Planning Commission are to make
26 a recommendation to the Board. Hopefully the draft plan will be ready
27 the third week of March.

- 28
- 29 • Chair Flynn-Asked if the Planning Commission should have a
30 joint hearing with Parks Board.

31

32 Fackler- Stated that Michael Tucker is the Chairman for the Parks
33 advisory Board and he is present to discuss that topic.

- 34
- 35 • John Ahl-Asked if there is a schedule or timeline for the
36 process.

37

38 Fackler- Stated he handed a schedule out at the January 10th meeting.

- 39
- 40 • Ahl-Asked what the Open Space Plan relationship was to the
41 Comprehensive Plan Update.

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

Fackler- Stated that it is an element to the Comprehensive Plan. Fackler has been attending the weekly 10-year comprehensive plan meetings. It is the intention of the Parks Department to keep the plan as consistent as possible in format. There will be a goals and policies and a goals and objectives section to the plan as well.

- Ahl-Asked if the Planning Commission is going to review the Open Space part of the plan.

Fackler-To his understanding prior to 2002, the Open Space Plan was not a required element to the County's Comprehensive Plan, it was optional. As of 2002 it is a required element funded by the State. Fackler stated there are two deadlines that need to be met, the first is the Parks deadline of June 1st and the second is DCD's deadline of December 31st.

- Ahl-Asked if there will be any changes to the plan during the 10-year update.

Fackler- Stated the efforts are also between Natural Resources and Public Works. The element is fairly specific to the Parks Department but it is not a regulatory plan.

- Coppola-Asked Fackler to clarify who attended the meetings Fackler had discussed before.

Fackler- Stated he was ill that day but he heard there were citizens from Bremerton Cruisers, Quad Drivers, and a Four Wheel Drive group. Fackler does not have the notes from the meeting but felt it was well attended. Mark Maurer, the Parks Director, felt good about the interaction and feedback. There were also unaffiliated citizens in attendance.

- Coppola-Asked how an organization could get their name added to the invitation list.

Fackler- Stated all that is needed is to sign up.

- Gustavson-Asked for clarification on the next meeting location.

1 **Fackler-Informed him it is tomorrow at the Long Lake Community**
2 **Center.**

- 3
4 • **Chair Flynn-Thought it seemed if you wanted, you could see**
5 **who attended the meetings on the web site.**

6
7 **Fackler-Informed the Commission that names and addresses were**
8 **not available on the web, only notes from the meeting.**

- 9
10 • **Chair Flynn-Asked what a group would need to do to send**
11 **comments in regards to a specific meeting.**

12
13 **Fackler-Stated the group could send an email.**

14
15 **Michael Tucker-Gave an update of the last Park's Board meeting. The**
16 **Open Space Plan is required by State law to be submitted on June**
17 **1st. The focus groups are being completed and the draft will be done**
18 **in the next month. Tucker asked if the Planning Commission would**
19 **be interested in making a recommendation to the Board of County**
20 **Commissioners on the Open Space Plan. The Parks Board does not**
21 **see it necessary to provided Comprehensive recommendations**
22 **because the views between both Bards are different.**

- 23
24 • **Gustavson-Feels because there will be land designation for**
25 **zoning, the Planning Commission should be involved with**
26 **making a recommendation.**

- 27
28 • **Chair Flynn-Asked if the Parks plan identifies the land or not.**

29
30 **Fackler-Stated not usually because it is public land. The Parks**
31 **Department is not saying they want to purchase a specific piece of**
32 **land.**

- 33
34 • **Ahl-Asked if the Parks plan is part of the Comprehensive Plan.**

35
36 **Tucker-Said it was.**

- 37
38 • **Chair Flynn-Asked when how the public hearing would be set**
39 **up.**

40
41 **Tucker- Stated there is currently a tentative date scheduled.**

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

- Chair Flynn-Feels it would be easier for the public to attend one meeting.
- Mahan-Asked if a joint meeting between the Planning Commission and the Parks Board is in order.
- Chair Flynn-Thought the Planning Commission’s recommendation could go to the Board separately.

A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Lary Coppola that the Planning Commission and Parks Board schedule a joint public hearing on the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan.

- Ahl-Asked if there will be another separate hearing?

Diener-Stated there will be a final public hearing on the 10-year update document.

- Chair Flynn-Stated a joint public hearing needs to be set up.

Diener-Stated staff can explore that option.

Eric Baker-The Open Space public hearing should meet the requirements of the Planning Commission’s public hearing.

- Chair Flynn-Asked Michael Tucker if the Parks Board has regularly scheduled meetings.

Tucker-Informed the Planning Commission that the Parks Board meets on the third Wednesday of every month.

- Chair Flynn-Would like to coordinate an evening hearing with the Parks Board.

Fackler-Requested an April meeting to allow adequate time for the recommendations to be taken into consideration before the Boards May 22nd meeting.

- Chair Flynn-Would like a meeting as soon as possible to allow the Planning Commission time to deliberate.

Fackler-Does not feel the plan will be extremely controversial.

The VOTE: Yes- 9 No-0

Motion carries

10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update

Baker-Informed the Planning Commission he is the project manager for the completion of the 10-year Comprehensive Plan Update by December 2006. The update is the top priority for the Board of County Commissioners in 2006. They have dedicated a significant amount of resources including staff and consultants. The estimated cost for the consultants is one million dollars. The 10-Year update is relatively specialized in what it is to accomplish in 2006. The areas include the incorporations of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan, the South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan, and the Silverdale Sub-Area Plan. As well as Urban Growth Area sizing, looking at appropriate sizing in regards to the 2005/2025 planning horizon. Currently the Comprehensive Plan goes to 2012, additional sub-area plans have moved that number up to 2017. The planning horizon varies from sub-area to sub-area. This 10-year update will pull all of the various urban growth areas together for one planning horizon, taking one set of population allocations, one set of employment allocations, and rolling them together for one Comprehensive unit. One issue of the UGA sizing is reasonable measures. If urban growth is not being met in the areas, the County is responsible for implementing reasonable measures, which are either to encourage or discourage development. The Board of County Commissioners has adopted 18 reasonable measures that will be reviewed and quantified, which is the most difficult part of reasonable measures. Rural wooded has also been moved into the 10-year update for final resolution one way or another. Staff has been working with the rural property owners to determine what the goals and polices are and what the regulations should be. The last area to look at for the update is code development. Kitsap County has been working to refine and updated it's County code in the areas of sub-division codes, zoning codes, procedures ordinance to make it clearer for the public, more consistent for staff and the public and to provide overall usability. It will culminate in the 10-year update.

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

- Ahl-Asked if the reasonable measures are part of the buildable lands.

Baker- Stated a set of reasonable measures were adopted by the Board in 2004, associated with the buildable lands analysis. It is a resolution and not necessarily incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. When you do urban growth area sizing consistent with the Growth Management Act and Hearings Board decisions, there are three steps to go through. They include determining the amount of land in the UGA, instituting reasonable measures, and then discussing UGA expansions.

- Ahl-Recalled making a recommendation on a long list of reasonable measures and feels they are confusing.
- Nevins-Does not recall making a recommendation on the reasonable measures, but recalls a packet of them being distributed to the Planning Commission.

Baker-Informed the Planning Commission that reasonable measures will probably be a work/study in itself. The Board has adopted 18 reasonable measures, the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) has a list of 46, Port Orchard had seven and Kingston had one.

- Taylor-Asked if reasonable measures came from the legislature.

Baker-Said they did. There was a land use reclassification request for the Kingston, Silverdale and Port Orchard sub-area plans. The County will be accepting land use reclassification requests for areas not involved with a sub-area plan over the course of the last 18 months. Land use requests would not be allowed for the Silverdale discussion areas, the Port Orchard/South Kitsap alternative four, or the Kingston Sub-Area plan. The requests must be UGA oriented; they must be for people to get in or out of the UGA. There will not be any requests for rural changes because the 10-year update is UGA centered.

- Gustavson-Asked if there will be rural to rural changes.

1 Baker-Informed him that it will be next year.

2

3

- Taylor- Stated in the past years, the Planning Commission handled the site specifics. In the last year, it seems it is being handled by another body. Taylor thought all of the requests had to be passed through the Planning Commission,

7

8 Baker-Believes all of the land use reclassification requests were
9 presented before the Planning Commission in the form of the sub-
10 area plan.

11

12

- Brian Bekeny-Asked what the difference between the site specifics and the land use reclassification request was.

13

14

15 Baker-The idea of the site specifics is that after everything is static,
16 people come in to look at individual itemized properties. That has not
17 happened in the past few years. There have been sub-area plans
18 going on, and the 10-year update going on which does not make site
19 specifics appropriate. The staff has recommended and the Board had
20 concurred that we can still allow land use reclassification requests
21 which are very similar to the site specifics because it is private
22 parties coming forward requesting new designation to their
23 properties and that can be folded into the sub-area plans. The pros
24 for the property owner are that there is not the \$2700.00 fee that
25 comes along with the site specific requests. The con is that it can be
26 reviewed as the whole, which involves a cumulative impact. The
27 Planning Commission decides if they want to handle them on an
28 individual basis, or as a whole.

29

30

- Taylor-Asked if the land owners are being given the opportunity to do what they would like with their property. Taylor does not believe in this last process they had and would like to vote on them on an individual basis.

31

32

33

34

35 Baker-All of the South and Central Kitsap land use reclassifications
36 that have not been decided on will go into the new pool with all of the
37 others that come in the next month. They will be looked at
38 cumulatively. It is almost impossible to look at them individually
39 when the Comp plan is in flux because the rest of it is a moving
40 target. The up side is it costs the applicant almost nothing.

41

- 1 • **Gustavson-Feels there should be a null set of site specifics and**
2 **a set for consideration.**
3
4 • **Chair Flynn-Stated that there was information on the land use**
5 **reclassification requests and the committees made a**
6 **recommendation of what to include and what to exclude. The**
7 **Planning Commission decided for the most part that the**
8 **committee’s recommendation is what would be forwarded.**
9

10 **Baker-All of the plans have been sized at 2025.**

- 11
12 • **Ahl-Feels part of the dilemma is the matter of scale. There has**
13 **been a lot of time spent deciding if one person’s property**
14 **should be included.**
15
16 • **Nevins-Feels with some of the site specific patterns, the word**
17 **planning should not be involved.**
18
19 • **Bekeny-Stated the process is not over and the Planning**
20 **Commission should wait to see the end results then deal with**
21 **site specifics.**
22

23 **Baker-Stated that the Board may allow site specifics in 2007 along**
24 **with working on the rural issues. During the 10-year update,**
25 **hopefully the Comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance will be**
26 **different. Right now they look almost identical. Every time a rezone is**
27 **submitted, it is an amendment to the Comprehensive plan. If the**
28 **Comp plan is more general then the idea of a rezone would come**
29 **back.**
30

31 **Break: 10:00AM**

32
33 **Baker-We will be discussing the visioning, alternative development**
34 **and decision making. Over the course of the next month we will be**
35 **discussing visioning for the 10-year update. We are going to have**
36 **three workshops at the end of the month to hear public input.**
37

- 38 • **Chair Flynn-Asked about the format.**
39

40 **Baker-Stated it is a workshop where people can get into workshops**
41 **to discuss visioning where staff will be the facilitators. From the**

1 visioning workshops we will be refining the 1998 Comprehensive
2 Plan. After that we will look at alternatives from April to July. There
3 will be three alternatives; alternative one, the no action alternative;
4 alternative two, the extensive alternative, which will look at the
5 largest area; and alternative three, the preferred alternative which is
6 in between alternatives one and two. Staff will be coming to the
7 Planning Commission in May for a joint work/study session with the
8 Board presenting the alternatives to see if they are appropriate to
9 take to the public. We will then take the alternatives to another set of
10 three workshops.

- 11
- 12 • **Bekeny-Asked if there was somewhere to see the dates and**
13 **other information.**
- 14

15 **Baker-Informed him all of the information is on the mykitsap.org web**
16 **site.**

- 17
- 18 • **Gustavson-Asked if the format at the workshops is to tell the**
19 **citizens what will be done to their property.**
- 20

21 **Baker-Stated that the workshops are part of the public involvement**
22 **process, and staff will be in attendance to facilitate. After all of the**
23 **comments are compiled, they will be shared with the Planning**
24 **Commission and Board. We will hopefully have the preferred**
25 **alternative. This is necessary because of the EIS, we need time for**
26 **the environmental review. If we have all of that done, we can start on**
27 **Capital Facilities, Transportation, Stormwater, etc.**

- 28
- 29 • **Gustavson-Feels the County needs to build the public's**
30 **confidence because there is no trust in the County after the**
31 **CAO.**
- 32

33 **Baker-Will be presenting public comments to all of the various**
34 **stakeholder groups.**

- 35
- 36 • **Chair Flynn-Feels the alternatives seem more like scenarios,**
37 **and staff might be setting themselves up for criticism if there**
38 **aren't any other alternatives.**
- 39

40 **Baker-Stated the alternatives are more for review, and there is still a**
41 **range.**

1 • **Chair Flynn-Understands that staff has to abide by SEPA**
2 **language, but feels if the alternatives are not really alternatives,**
3 **they should be called scenarios. Chair Flynn does not think the**
4 **alternatives are buyable and doesn't want to take the criticism**
5 **that may come.**

6
7 • **Bekeny-Feels if there is a section taken from all three**
8 **alternatives to make a fourth one, that might help.**

9
10 **Baker-Understands the concern about the terminology.**

11
12 • **Chair Flynn-Reiterated the concern for more alternatives.**

13
14 • **Ahl-Is not comfortable making changes to the alternatives if the**
15 **budget is not there for the consultants.**

16
17 **Baker-Said he would check to see what is available for the**
18 **consultant's budget.**

19
20 • **Ahl-Asked when will the Planning Commission receive staff's**
21 **alternatives.**

22
23 **Baker- Stated that staff will not have anything until the formal**
24 **decision making.**

25
26 • **Ahl-Stated that staff did not have a recommendation for the Port**
27 **Orchard/South Kitsap Plan.**

28
29 • **Coppola-Stated that staff had opportunity to express a**
30 **recommendation.**

31
32 • **Taylor-Felt the Planning Commission was held hostage at the**
33 **end of last year and stated the BOCC can move forward without**
34 **a recommendation if there is not enough time.**

35
36 **Baker-Said there will be joint meetings between the BOCC and the**
37 **Planning Commission. Also, at the workshops staff will be receiving**
38 **public comment and any environmental impacts that have not been**
39 **recognized.**

40

- 1 • Gustavson-Feels the EIS is a very important part of the process
2 and wants to find out what is feasible and desirable.
3

4 A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by Lary
5 Coppola that staff provide drawings of each UGA delineating all of
6 the critical areas in the UGA to the Planning Commission and the
7 public.

- 8
- 9 • Gustavson-Showed an example of what he was requesting on a
10 map he provided.
11
- 12 • Ahl-Is Feels it is inappropriate to incorporate CAO when this is
13 a Comprehensive Plan discussion.
14
- 15 • Gustavson-Stated if there is not a foundation set, the public will
16 get the wrong idea.
17
- 18 • Coppola-Disagrees with John Ahl and would like to see the
19 maps Mike Gustavson requested.
20

21 Baker-Said there is no problem providing the maps.
22

- 23 • Mahan-Asked if Gustavson wanted the maps provided at the
24 meetings.
25
- 26 • Gustavson-Indicated he did because they will be helpful for the
27 public.
28
- 29 • Mahan-Stated he would have to vote against the motion.
30
- 31 • Taylor-Feels having the maps at the March 23rd meeting would
32 be sufficient enough.
33
- 34 • Bekeny-Feels Gustavson should withdraw his motion.
35
- 36 • Gustavson-Withdrew his motion.
37

38 A motion was made by Mike Gustavson and seconded by John
39 Taylor that staff provide the building limitations map with the new
40 CAO to the March 23rd meeting.

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

**The VOTE: Yes-4 No-4 Abstained-1
Motion failed.**

A motion was made by Monty Mahan and seconded by Mike Gustavson that the maps are provided at the next Planning Commission meeting.

**The VOTE: Yes-9 No-0
Motion carried.**

- Mahan-Asked that the preferred alternative be brought to the Planning Commission and also asked who the project manager is.

Baker- Stated he was the project manager.

- Mahan-Asked if this is a budget year for the Commissioners.

Baker-Said that it was.

- Taylor-Asked about a joint meeting with the Board to discuss housekeeping items.

Baker-Feels it will be very difficult to get on the Commissioner's calendar unless necessary.

Department Updates

Bolger- Stated that if the Planning Commissioners would like to have a joint meeting, they needed to think of agenda items he could present to the BOCC. Bolger informed the Planning Commission that the Board is very busy and it might be difficult to schedule a meeting. Bolger informed the Planning Commission that the managers meet on a weekly basis along with Chris Gears. Eric Baker has been identified as the Project Manager for the 10-year update and has been removed from his role as Current Planning Manager. Dave Greetham has been assigned as interim Current Planning Manager. The County has hired consultants to assist with backlog. Also, supervision for the Fire Marshall's Department is being handled by Mike Barth and Randy Law. The County has met with the fire districts and they are

1 helping with day to day activities. The Department of Community
2 Development has gone through an analysis and a recommendation
3 will be presented to the Board in April. The County will also be
4 looking for a new director in April.

- 5
- 6 • Chair Flynn-Asked how many vacancies are in DCD.
- 7

8 Bolger-Thought about 8-10.

- 9
- 10 • Gustavson-Asked if some of the extra help employees are
11 retired.
- 12

13 Bolger-Indicated they were.

- 14
- 15 • Gustavson-Asked if they are qualified.
- 16

17 Bolger-Stated they were.

- 18
- 19 • Taylor-Stated that the real estate community was sad to see
20 Dave Greetham change roles in Kitsap County because he had
21 been so helpful.
- 22

- 23 • Chair Flynn-Asked who was taking over for Dave Greetham
- 24

25 Bolger-Stated all of the managers are helping fill the role.

26 Bolger also stated that both Dave and Eric have the opportunity to
27 return to their original roles.

- 28
- 29 • Taylor-Asked who the consultants are that will be working on
30 the 10-year update.
- 31

32 Bolger-Informed them that they are Jones and Stokes and AHBL.

- 33
- 34 • Chair Flynn-Feels it is very important to make sure the Planning
35 Commission is on the calendar for a joint public hearing.
- 36

- 37 • Coppola-Asked if DCD is running smoothly without anyone in
38 charge.
- 39

40 Bolger-Informed him the management team is working well together.

1
2 Diener-Informed the Planning Commission that Jerry Harless and
3 Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning filed an appeal on the
4 Kingston Sub-Area Plan.

- 5
6 • Chair Flynn-Asked if there was a deadline for the appeal.

7
8 Diener-Yes, it is under review for six months.

- 9
10 • Taylor-Asked if the Kingston appeal was the only appeal at this
11 time.

12
13 Diener-Stated that it was.

14
15 Transportation Presentation

16
17 Greg Cioc-Explained 2003 Existing Conditions, 2025 Kingston
18 without a connector road, and 2025 Kingston with a connector road.

- 19
20 • Taylor-Asked if Bainbridge Island had a solution for the
21 Highway 305 ferry traffic.

22
23 Cioc-Informed the Planning Commission that Kitsap Transit is doing
24 a study about the traffic.

- 25
26 • Taylor-Asked if anything would happen in the next 10 years.

27
28 Cioc-Stated most likely.

29
30 Jim Rogers-Showed the Planning Commission a transportation
31 model presentation for the next 20 years from down town Kingston to
32 Miller Bay Road.

- 33
34 • Mahan-Asked if the presentation included reckless drivers.

35
36 Rogers-Said they were included.

- 37
38 • Bekeny-Asked how many levels there are.

39
40 Rogers-Said they have levels A-F, like school grades. A being the
41 best and F being the worst.

- 1 • Mahan-Asked if there was a model that showed a bridge from
2 Illahee to Seattle.

3
4 Rogers-Did not have one.

- 5
6 • Ahl-Asked about a model showing a bridge from Bremerton to
7 Bainbridge Island.

8
9 Cioc-Stated that PSRC is updating their transportation for 40 years of
10 major projects that they may be included in.

11
12 Other Business

- 13
14 • Chair Flynn-Asked if the Planning Commission would still like a
15 joint meeting.
16
17 • Taylor-Stated that he has requested such meeting three
18 different times and thinks it is important for the Planning
19 Commission to have a joint meeting with the Board.
20
21 • Mahan-Stated it did not matter to him if there was a joint
22 meeting. Coppola agreed.
23
24 • Bekeny-Thinks a joint meeting would be good to see what the
25 Board is expecting from the Planning Commission in 2006.
26
27 • Nevins-Does not want a meeting without an agenda.

28
29 Discussion was held by the Planning Commissioners on agenda
30 topics for the joint meeting.

31
32 A motion was made by John Taylor and seconded by Mike
33 Gustavson that a meeting be scheduled by May 31st with Board of
34 County Commissioners.

35
36 The VOTE: Yes-6 No-0 Abstained-2
37 Motion Carries.

- 38
39 • Nevins-Would like to see an agenda before they have a meeting.
40

Kitsap County Planning Commission –February 28, 2006

- **Chair Flynn-Does not want to hash out CAO items, but would like to discuss roles, expectations and other housekeeping items.**

D. 12:10PM Meeting Adjourned with no further business.

Exhibit No.	Description
--------------------	--------------------

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| A. | February 28, 2006 Agenda |
| B. | Legal public notice for the February 28, 2006 Planning Commission work study session |
| C. | Memo from Rick Fackler bout Cost/Use analysis requests |
| D. | Building limitations map submitted by Mike Gustavson |
| E. | 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Schedule |
| F. | Transportation Presentation |
| G. | January 24th Minutes |

MINUTES approved this _____ day of _____ 2006.

Deborah Flynn, Chair

Brynan Pierce, Planning Commission Secretary