



**Department of Parks and Recreation**  
614 Division Street, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366  
Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385

---

**Kitsap County Parks and Recreation Advisory Board  
REGULAR BUSINESS MEETING  
June 18, 2008**

Buck Lake County Park  
Hansville Community Center  
6780 NE Buck Lake Road  
Hansville, WA 98366  
5:00 to 8:30 p.m.

**Board members present:** Danny Horowitz, Frank Stowell, Phedra Elliott, Don Large, Don Martin, Joleen Palmer, Judy Matchett, Mark Fischer, Michael Tucker, Kathleen Simpson.

**Parks and Recreation staff present:** Chip Faver, Martha Droge, Matthew Keogh, Dori Leckner, Arvilla Ohlde. Terri Lyman, Tarrah Dofelmier, Elizabeth Ratliff.

**I. Welcome & Introductions**

*Meeting called to order by Frank Stowell. 5:09 PM*

Welcome by Frank Stowell. Introductions by board and parks staff.

**II. Agenda and Minute Review**

*Motion: Approve Agenda-Don accepts agenda as published - Michael 2<sup>nd</sup> All in Favor – All*

*Motion: Approve minutes from the May 21, 2008 meeting - Don accepts minutes as published Michael 2<sup>nd</sup> - All in favor-All*

**III. Opportunity for the public to address the Board on items not on the Agenda**

None at this time

**IV. Park Project Update: RCO Grants, North End Projects, and Project Highlights**

Matt Keogh, Parks Planning Project Manager for the County, gave an update on Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) grants. Matt stated there are a total of twelve RCO grants but that they are being refined. Matt stated that in one instance, Parks is working with Public Works on a grant for Clear Creek Trail. Matt hoped the Parks Board members were able to receive grant summaries and advised them they have access to the information online and through Parks staff.

Frank asked Matt about the grant information session he attended in Olympia. Matt said it was a technical review. Matt stated RCO was pleased with our work and the amount of staff support we brought with us. We were given an opportunity to strengthen our grants. Matthew discussed the 3 grants preliminarily presented thus far which include replacing the bulkhead at Anna Smith Park, South Kitsap Regional Park and Norwegian Point Park.

Frank asked about the West Peninsula Regional Trail Plan. Matt stated we have 2 grants on this project. The Department of Natural Resources is very excited about this. Mason County, the City of Bremerton, Kitsap County and the Navy are all sub-sponsors. Regional trail planning is catching a lot of attention in Olympia. We are working to coordinate both motorized and non motorized trail functions. The trail plan will include analysis of the Coulter Creek Park and a piece of property across Sinclair Inlet.

Danny asked about private property. Matt said that Pope Resources and Olympic have inquired into possible trail connections. Danny mentioned Alpine Evergreen and said University of Washington possibly owns property in Seabeck. Matthew thanked the board for their comments and asked them to please send him the board's input.

Mathew stated the South Kitsap Master Plan is underway and thanked everyone who attended the first meeting. There are a lot of people sharing their ideas. People seem to be buying into the planning process together not individually. Matt talked about the next meeting regarding SK Regional Park which will be held at the administrative building in Port Orchard in the Commissioners Chambers on July 16, 2008. The last meeting had 200 people in attendance.

Danny asked about funding levels for grants and asked for reasoning behind funding. Chip explained scores are given by RCO evaluators. Chip stated RCO sets funding levels policies and also tells us what's available after legislative fund appropriation.

## **V. Board Committee Updates:**

### **Task Force Committee**

Kathleen explained the role of the task force committee. The Task Force Committee has met to discuss and define the scope of work for assessing park inventory in relation to recommendation #7 and scope of work for the feasibility study of the events center in relation to recommendation #5. The task force committee recommended moving forward with the Special Event Center Study. The committee will be adding a fair board member to the sustainability task force committee.

While the committee has discussed the parks inventory project as well as reviewed the Park Unit Asset Evaluation Study submittal from Parametrix, the committee recommends the department pull back from this project at this time and establish a better defined framework within which the project is to be completed.

*Don approved these updates Frank 2<sup>nd</sup> – All in favor- All*

### **Park Code Revision Committee:**

Michael stated a Rough draft of the code revision is at the County Prosecutor's Office and the Parks Code Revision committee will bring it before the Parks Board in July. It will then go to the BOCC this fall for approval.

## **VI. Director and Staff Reports:**

### **Director's Report**

Chip talked about the new Stewardship Coordinator that was recently hired. Lorie will start Monday; she has an extensive background and has lots of experience. Lorie even has experience as a Park Ranger. She is comfortable going out in the community and the community will be comfortable with her.

### **Capital Facilities Plan Update by Elizabeth**

Elizabeth handed out new Capital Facilities Plan that will go through 2008-2013. Elizabeth stated she wanted to review the plan with the Parks Board, get your comments and input and we'll come back next month. Between next month's meeting and the September meeting we want to present it to BOCC, get their input and have time to come back to you before it goes to the planning commission. Elizabeth gave a description of each grant listed on the plan and gave a time line for each of them. Elizabeth stated this is just a plan; it is not a problem to move the money to the next year. Elizabeth stated the PRAB and Commissioners are going to make the determination on some of these projects whether or not we have the money for them.

Ben Holland the County Budget Director has come out and said there is no more Real Estate Excise Tax money or impact fees. Future projects will need to find financing. Elizabeth said she would email the board a chart that Ben Holland made.

We have put some unidentified open space in the plan some; this is again where we need some direction from the board. Every year there are suggestions for purchasing various pieces of land. We need to make

a decision of whether or not we want to have money allocated for that. We do not have the funding, it would have to be some type of bond issue. It's in the plan but it can be amended at a later date. Chip talked about unidentified open space in the plan, these are derived from levels of service. When we take a piece of property we would like to see a criteria to determine if the land meets the needs that we stated in our comprehensive plan as a piece of property that fits the community's needs county wide. Frank said we need to work the criteria into the Open Space Plan. Chip talked about the land acquisition team. This is an internal County committee tasked with defining County interest in new properties. Chip will bring the information from those meetings forward to the Parks Board.

Frank said another item that needs to be rectified is the spontaneous gifting of property. It seems that in the past whether or not it meets criteria has not been looked at and the Parks Department seems to be responsible for taking care of the property. Frank asked if there will be a mechanism to determine if the land is needed. It was discussed by board members that there was possibly a criteria used in the past. That subject will be researched and more information will come at the next meeting.

Frank Stowell stated the importance of going to Olympia and doing the technical review. The fact that the whole Senior Management Team went to Olympia to participate and learn really shows the State how serious we are about this. The value we are getting from the new staff members Martha, Matt and Arvilla are already showing positive results and increases the prospects of getting some great things happening for Kitsap County.

#### **IX. Norwegian Point Master Plan Review**

Frank welcomed everyone and thanked them for coming. Introductions by the Parks Board. Frank explained the board's role is to act as an interface between the public and the commissioners. We want to get a sense of the community's views of the Norwegian Point Master Plan. Frank introduced Arvilla and the Berger Partnership. Frank stated after the presentation we want to hear from you (the community.) This is a concept plan. We could vote to push this plan forward if that's what you want to do. Frank stated this is a great opportunity for us to get together.

Arvilla stated the property was purchased in 2005. It was administered by RCO grants. Arvilla talked about the 1<sup>st</sup> grant in the preliminary stages which is the passive grant. You can see it in the public system called the Prism System under the RCO. Everyday the grant changes, narrative changes. It is moving all the time, but at the point of July 1 it becomes complete and no changes will be made. One of the biggest scorings is public support. The competition is unbelievable. The number of grants coming in are \$325 million dollars. At the last session they only funded 100 million dollars. Every score is extremely important.

The grant that we are working on is called the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Grant Program under the Water Access Program. We put the grant in for 1 million dollars. We would then in 2008 if the scoring is high, fund it in the legislature in 2009. We would then put in an Aquatic Land Enhancement Grant for the other side of the development. By Nov 2009 you should have 1 million. By January 2010 we will be ready to develop the key elements of that grant. The other grant is a Planning Grant. The big question is how could we get the pier repaired and what grant would fit that. If you put in a floating dock for motorized boats, there is a funding program through boater excise tax. At that point we would put in a planning grant to say we could in fact get engineering & specification to repair the pier and get a seasonal floating dock on it.

Arvilla stated because the historical report is pending, the board may elect to passing the Master Plan which includes the passive elements pier and deck with the feasibility and long term decisions on the buildings focused later as a study that is adopted as an addendum to the adopted master plan at the completion of the structure report.

#### **Presentation by Berger Partnership (Jonathan Morley and Dana Sykes)**

We would like to touch on the process that we have been involved in to date. We would like to relay some comments/information back to you that we have heard from all of you through the course of our meetings and then we would like to go through the elements of the plan. Berger passed out plans showing the key elements of the master plan. Jonathan stated we have been working on this project since January. We met here with many of you. This is where we looked at site analysis and weapon factors. We had brainstorming sessions to get your ideas out in the open. We then went back and put shape/form to your

ideas. All ideas were taken into account and we generated a number of alternatives. In addition we created an email address and there were mail in surveys. That was an incredible help to us.

Jonathan gave a summary of the community's comments and ideas for the park.

- Passive use
- Low Key
- Natural character
- Quiet, non program uses
- Minimal development, minimal parking
- Restoring fishing pier
- Day lighting creek
- Native planting low impact development
- Restore fishing pier day lighting the creek to deal with flooding issues.

Given all the input we received, we have a challenge which is creating a passive park in Hansville.

### **Key Elements-**

Program Element hand out was passed out.

1. Fishing Pier
2. Non-Motorized Boat Launch
3. Restored Deck
4. Public Promenade
5. Community Gathering Space
6. Flat Topped Structures
7. Unprogrammed open space
8. Parking Lot
9. Picnic Pods
10. Vegative Screen
11. Bridge Over Finn Creek
12. Day lighted Finn Creek
13. Crushed Rock Trail
14. Bird Viewing Platform
15. Private Property
16. South Parking Lot

Jonathan opened up the discussion for public comments questions.

1. Name Unknown: Inquiring about the boat dock. Bringing in the traffic will be hurtful to the community. Arvilla stated the bid has gone out; the motorized boat dock would be seasonal.
2. Marion King: Asked for Clarification on bridge over Finn Creek
3. Art Ellison: On Motorized Boat Launch: Will there be problems with too much parking in area 8 (lot) and walking to boat launch? Jonathan stated we tried to use the space we have. You could pull a kayak up anywhere. The restored dock area is a logical spot to bring Kayaks up.
4. Gary Paulson: Asked about high tides and intrusion. John stated a detailed hydrologist study is critical. John talked about engineering for storm events.
5. Carl Berg: It was mentioned at the last meeting regarding the flat topped structures. The roofs are valuable. Suggestion would be to take the walls out and use them as Picnic Shelters. Remove the structures and keep the roofs. Arvilla added that picnic shelters do meet the grant requirements.
6. Name Unknown: Suggestion to move the Bird viewing platform closer to the shoreline. This would enhance the types of birds available for viewing. Jon stated he thought that was a good idea and that the platform is flexible on its location.

7. Mary Booth: The flat topped structures are right in the middle of the open space. Open space is very important. Mary stated she is strongly opposed to retaining these buildings. Talked about the private property that is holding up the sale. Looking forward to day lighting Finn Creek. Chip stated we need to complete the purchase; we have a proposal and a price. Chip said it should happen in a matter of weeks.
8. Marion Clay: There are alternatives to concrete and asphalt and I encourage the parks board to look into these. There are hawks that sit on power lines on the private property. If this is cleared it takes away from the habitat. I strongly consider keeping it natural.
9. Jon: Suggest enhancing more day lighting & keeping it natural.
10. Tony Atchinson: Suggested putting together a farmers market. This would be a boom to the community. Tony asked if they could consider the views of residents' who will be looking down onto the property not just the view of residents looking out on to the property.
11. Mike Brinton: Suggested working with community members. Mike commended Berger , Chip, Dori and the County Parks Department. They have done a great job of resolving the issues. Mike stated he is not in favor of retaining the buildings.
12. Rebecca Pirtle: Asked about the 3 cabins, RCO grant and the restaurant building plan. Arvilla stated that we asked for an extension on the grant and they have allowed it. Arvilla talked about the archeological factors, whether it be taking a photo and placing a plaque. There are no grant restrictions on the restaurant building. These decisions will be made outside the Parks Master Plan.
13. Suggestion to knock the roof off the building and turn it back into a dock.
14. Heather Goodmanson: Concerned that there is no access to the post office from the park.
15. Comment from audience member. Do not like the buildings, want to see more of the beach. Stated that a majority of the web comments don't like the buildings. What is the timetable? I have witnessed kids jumping off roofs of buildings. There are safety issues with keeping the buildings. What is the budget for maintenance now? Arvilla talked about a report that will come out in a couple weeks. She stated that the permit process was done and demolition was about to begin and then the archeological aspect came in to play. We are now required to notify them of any ground disturbance.
16. Lou Norat: This is a special and unique park with great views and great waterfront. The last 13 years the public has been excluded. The effort to rebuild the deck in the master plan is brilliant. I would like to see people use this area as a gathering site. I favor the open space and would like to see the building eliminated. Please keep in mind that this is a park, and please consider the focal point. My only concern is the buildings will delay development and cause a safety hazard.
17. Mike Florg: What qualifies the area as historic? Arvilla stated an 1891 ceramic smoking pipe was found.
18. Name Unknown: It was brought to our attention that the cabins were moved here not originated here. Arvilla stated if you have information on that please let us know.
19. Chip stated we know you as a community want to make a decision. We want you to be prepared and have all the information to make the right decision. We want to move forward with this efficiently. Arvilla stated the importance of matching one grant against another. This is a way to be cost effective.
20. Sid Knutson: Congratulated the Consultants and the County Staff. I really like the plan.

21. Dedra Duffy; Are we setting the buildings aside, will we come back to these at a later point and please consider the historical and emotion significance of the buildings. I feel very strongly about keeping the buildings. How will you be measuring the community support? Vote etc? How will you prevent the community from going against each other?
22. Chip stated we will let the community decide. We will set up models, listen and give you all the facts so you can make the right decision. There will have to be some give and take. Frank asked Dedra what she thought would be the best way. She suggested a larger meeting covering a larger region of residents. Chip stated the parks dept has an appreciation of the public process and will make every effort. The commissioners will make the decision in the end. In the meantime please send your comments to the Parks Board.
23. Sherry Kille: Is there a website available? There is a very small part of this community at this meeting. Martha Droge referenced the site that was recently created for SK Park. SKPark.org we can use this to set up a model. There is an email, also a toll free number we set up. We can do this for Norwegian Point Park.
24. Adam Zachary talked about the high fishing economy in the 1950's. He would like to see the building stick around because they are such a huge part of Hansville's history. Adam stated he has flooding concerns and day lighting concerns as they might impact the property across the street.
25. Lou Norat: Asked about the timeline for the project. The Board could make the decision tonight to approve the passive part of the park. From there we would pass the information on to the County Commissioners that we want their support. The grant does require a site plan. Once you get the grants you'll have the money to do the engineering and architectural work. Arvilla stated will know pretty quickly by September whether or not you will receive the grant. If the grant is not successful the parks department would look at how to use local dollars for the master plan. The next grant opportunity is in 2009 for Aquatic Land Enhancement. Development could begin in 2010.
26. Rob: Can the pier be separated from the other buildings? Stated the importance on rebuilding the pier. Arvilla stated the pier and the dock and is a grant under the boater facility excise tax that you pay on boat motor tax. That grant is funded each year. Arvilla stated this will be a planning grant. (engineering, design, permits) We will engineer what it will look like and then another grant will be put in for the development. The restored dock is part of the boater facility plan not the passive plan.
27. Unknown Name: The pier plan was brought up (seasonal boat launch) Arvilla stated the grant funding source will be taken away if there is no motorized boat dock. We are competing for grants to facilitate reconstruction of the pier. Motorized Boats only apply to this grant. You have the choice to raise your own money to rebuild the pier or let the motorboats in.
28. Unknown name: What is the size of the pier and float? Martha stated that the float may not even be feasible due to tidal and shoreline issues. The aquatic structure needs to be looked at. Don Large stated from looking at this key the dock is 80 ft and the Pier is 40 ft. Boat size restriction would be no bigger than a 28ft boat allowed on the float.
29. Howie O'Brien: Recommended the picnic tables be moved to the upper beach.
30. Mike Seefer: What are you going to do with the buildings paint them and board them up?

Frank recommended moving forward with the passive elements. Frank stated it seems everyone loves the passive portion; we just need to get all the information on the buildings. There are some very different ideas. Frank asked if the board wants to move forward with the passive portion of the park and come back to you the community with more information on the building.

*Frank made a motion to move forward with the passive elements of the park with the idea to revisit the building issue and a promise of a September meeting to follow up. Don Large 2<sup>nd</sup>. All in Favor-ALL*