

TASK	RELATIONSHIP
PRES	Speak for Yourself
Ask Questions	Listen Actively
Summarize	Gatekeeping
Polling	Compliment & Agree
80/20 Principle	Humor
Build Consensus	Process Check



What are we asking for?
 Why is it important?
 Is it realistic?

MAY 13th, 2009 MINUTES
 BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS – MANAGEMENT TEAM
 WORK/STUDY SESSION
 8:30 AM

Attending: Charlotte Garrido, Chair; Steve Bauer, Commissioner, Josh Brown, Commissioner; Nancy Buonanno Grennan, County Administrator; Larry Keeton, Director Community Development; Dennis Oost; Katrina Knutsen; Scott Diener; Cindy Read, Community Development; Shelley Kneip, Prosecutor’s Office; Eric Baker, Commissioners; Angie Silva, Commissioners; Chip Faver, Director Parks & Recreation; Matthew Keough, Parks & Recreation; Jeff Rowe-Hornbaker, Community Development; Sue Schroader, Olympic Property Group; Tom McBride, McBride Public Affairs; Burt Furuta, Director Personnel and Human Services; Sandra Staples-Bortner, Erik Pedersen, Great Peninsula Conservancy; Vivian Henderson, KAPO; Alison O’Sullivan, Melody Allen, Suquamish Tribe; Chris Dunagan, Kitsap Sun; Gene Bullock, Kitsap Audubon Society; Tom Nevins; Tom Donnelly, KCRP; Linda Berry-Maraist, North Kitsap Trails Association; Lou Foritano, Planning Commission; Ryan Sandstrom, Alpine Evergreen David Overton, Overton Associates; Tara Lemm, NK Herald; Daria Nelson; Rod Reid, Alpine Evergreen; Michael Yadrick, GPC; Stephanie Pinard, Budget; Dave Tucker, Public Works; Bryn Grimley, Kitsap Sun; Terri Lyman, Parks and Recreation

Anticipated Time

1. APPROVE MINUTES OF 04-29-09 8:30 – 8:35

Minutes were approved at submitted.

2. RURAL WOODED INCENTIVE PROGRAM – KATRINA KNUTSON ([pdf](#)) 8:35 – 10:35

Shelley gave historical background information and talked about the criteria used for designating various classifications.

Larry talked about the definition of “rural character” – need to focus on what it looks like today and what it will look like in 20, 30, 40 years in the future and how the county can provide local government services. We need to look at what other uses can be in rural areas – what other industries would be appropriate.

Board's Guiding Values for RWIP:

- **Fiscal Responsibility and Sustainability**
- **Inter-jurisdictional coordination**
- **Economy, Environment, Community**
- **Preservation of Rural Character**
- **Compliance with the Washington State Growth Management Act**
- **Open Space**

The Board's vision for Kitsap: Along with the Kitsap County Vision Statement, they would like Kitsap County to be known for vibrant, healthy waterfront cities with a strong rural character.

Questions-Forest:

- 1) **Is a 100 year old Douglas Fir more beneficial to the environment than a 50 year old Fir?**
- 2) **What is the County's ability to affect timber management practices in open space, i.e., could the County specify selective logging vs. clear cuts?**
- 3) **How significant is forestry to the Kitsap County economy? The binder indicates that there are only 20+ forestry related permanent jobs in the County. The comprehensive plan does not designate any commercially viable forest lands in the County.**
- 4) **How does a one-time infusion of funds for the property owner allow them to maintain active forestry if forestry is not economically viable?**
- 5) **Is preservation of a mature forest more important and beneficial than on-going forestry resulting in less mature forests?**
- 6) **What are the criteria in determining if land is prime for forestry?**
- 7) **What criteria were used when designating current Forest Resource Lands in Kitsap County?**

Questions – Wildlife/Environment

- 1) **Given the fact that the majority of 20 acre parcels are largely left in forest use, how significant a difference is there on wildlife/aquifer recharge/groundwater/stormwater from 20 acre parcels compared to larger tracts?**
- 2) **What are the impacts of these rural subdivisions on aquifer recharge compared to 20 acre home sites?**
- 3) **Are we better off with 20 acre home sites?**

Questions - Fiscal

- 1) **What are the public service costs associated with an 800 lot subdivision adjacent to Port Gamble compared to the revenues generated. Include transit, fire service, school district costs, law enforcement, transportation and others as appropriate. Would the governmental units prefer to service that population at Port Gamble or in existing cities and urban growth areas.**
- 2) **How does a one-time infusion of funds for the property owner allow them to maintain active forestry if forestry is not economically viable?**
- 3) **How do we provide local government services to the rural areas under a constrained County budget? To what degree would urban areas be subsidizing clusters?**
- 4) **How do we connect large clusters to roads that we can not afford?**
- 5) **What are the incremental costs associated with the density increase proposed by RWIP?**

Questions-Growth Management

- 1) What are the historical rural businesses in Kitsap County?
- 2) What are the historical rural uses in Kitsap County?
- 3) What would be the impact adding 8,000 additional homes to those already permitted under current zoning and previously vested on the urban/rural population targets adopted in the County Planning Policies?
- 4) The County apparently did some polling or community meeting/polling affecting this topic in 2000. What would it cost to update that effort now?
- 5) Should RWIP have a different set of criteria for different areas of the County?
- 6) What are the benefits and downsides of clustering?
- 7) Are there other jurisdictions that have a thriving rural clustering program? What do their evaluations show?
- 8) What would RWIP at full build-out look like?

Questions - Trails

- 1) OPG has said that it intends to get out of Kitsap County. What happens when OPG sells to another owner who may not share OPG values and commitments?
- 2) Where would funding for maintenance of a trail system come from?
- 3) Are there other alternatives to achieving public access/trails?
- 4) The North Kitsap Trails Association has suggested creating a Metropolitan Parks District to fund trail maintenance. Could an MPD be created to purchase trail easements as well as maintain trails?
- 5) Given the popularity of trails, should Kitsap County consider a bond measure to fund trail acquisition?
- 6) What if the Open Space were turned over to a non-profit trails group for stewardship? Similar organizations apparently exist on the East Coast for preservation of timber lands and the option is under consideration in Washington as well. Could this group raise enough from selective logging to support trail and forest management? Explore other success stories.

DCD Staff Responsibilities:

- 1) Provide recommendation regarding the current moratorium.
- 2) Provide a comparison of the 20-acre parcels vs clustering. Clustering has benefits, are there any drawbacks?
- 3) Provide any available fiscal information.
- 4) Provide forestry/wildlife information.

(Synopsis provided by Katrina Knutsen)

Steve asked how does RWIP program sync with all requirements of GMA?

FIVE MINUTE BREAK

10:35 – 10:40

3. LEGISLATIVE BRIEFING – TOM MCBRIDE ([pdf](#))

10:40 – 11:40

Tom briefly summarized Washington state 2009 legislative highlights.

- Suggested we settle on our legislative objectives this summer.

- **Tom would like to focus on: Targeted meetings with our delegation and thank you letters to those people; meetings with Leadership in both House and Senate and with legislators who chaired the issues of particular interest to us.**

Josh told Tom that he has done a great job this year and heard nothing but positive things from legislators and other counties. Charlotte and Steve agreed.

Tom said he is interested in what worked best and what didn't.....weekly calls etc. He suggested that report for next year be shorter. He encouraged the board to give him their constructive thoughts and ideas. Steve said with the combination of work Tom is doing, staff support and Board willing to get involved, this was a model program this year. The Board asked if there are things Tom needs from them to allow him to be more effective and make better use of his time. Josh said we need to figure out how we can continue to work more closely with our legislators. They agreed the priority next fall is to find more revenue.

The Board and Nancy commented that Tom's reports have been clear and concise and he has done an outstanding job this year and thanked him for all his hard work. Tom said it is a privilege and honor to work for Kitsap County.

4. DEVELOPMENT CODE FOR STORMWATER – DAVE TUCKER ([pdf](#)) 11:40 – 12:40

Dave talked about title 12 and said his recommendation is that the Board direct staff to schedule a public hearing for an ordinance to implement title 12 changes. The permit covers actions related to Stormwater in 6 categories:

- **Public Involvement**
- **Public Education**
- **Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination**
- **Construction Stormwater Control**
- **Post Construction Stormwater Control**
- **Good Housekeeping for Municipal Operations**

Steve asked they spend a minute to understand what's going to be different on the ground when we do this and does this end up looking significantly different that what we've done in the past. Dave discussed the difference and what it means.

In January 2009 the Board agreed with the staff recommendations to base new development regulations pertaining to Stormwater on these 8 focus areas:

- **Treat water as a resource**
- **Preserve Groundwater Recharge**
- **Reduce Pollutant Loading of Runoff**
- **Preserve Low Energy Flow Regime**
- **Use Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans**
- **Adaptively Manage Technical Stormwater Management Tools**
- **Dual Use of Land**
- **Maintain Facility Function**

Dave state is proposing have to take action by late June.

10 MINUNTE BREAK

5. WAAGA WAY DECISION – ERIC BAKER/ANGIE SILVA

12:50 – 1:20

Eric Baker – continuation of pubic hearing on Waaga way connector roads and Silverdale Design Standards to the Waaga Way Town Center. Points Discussed:

- Steve said it was interesting Monday night there was not a lot of attendance from people invested in this.
- Charlotte liked seeing topographical map.
- Josh felt there weren't enough true standards.
- Put design review committee in place.
- On pitched roof requirement we need to decide what we are designing for.
- Steve asked if we are talking about roof elevations or façade – should make that clear, especially to those writing the standards.

Josh moved adoption of ordinance in many portions of the Silverdale Design Standards in Kitsap County Code Title 17 consolidating the use tables relating to the Waaga Way Town Center. All 3 in favor, motion carried.

- Steve proposed motion to include façade as and option in areas where roof elevation is mentioned. Approved unanimously.
- Discussed minimum parking required by code. Eric said it is 5 parking space per 1000 sq ft of general retail space.
- Discussed bike lanes on connector roads; having on both sides would make more usable.
- Internal pedestrian foot pathways to include bike lanes was talked about last meeting. – would like to revisit that. Need to rethink if that is really necessary.
- Discussed compatibility with existing uses of surrounding land.
- Talked about connector road off Old Frontier. Board asked Eric to talk about traffic on surrounding roads.

The Board would like a more time to discuss the issues of connectivity between the connector road and Old Frontier Road. As the moratorium expires tomorrow, there was discussion about extending it another week. After legal review, staff recommended adopting the connector road without a connection to Old Frontier at this time. Charlotte Moved to adopt the ordinance with the change to remove the paragraph on page 3.

Josh moved to adopt section 10.4 as revised. Change beginning the third full paragraph: Dele 4th sentence to end; beginning at “Depending on the development...” The connection between the cul de sac and Old Frontier Road (Phase two) shall be determined through a future planning process.” All in favor – motioned carried.

Staff was provide additional information regarding the connector road connection to Old Frontier and return to the Board in the near future.

6. BOARD DISCUSSION

1:20 – 2:00

Discussed monthly lunch with Elected and decided to return to the 11:00 am meeting with one Commissioner and then a brown bag lunch in Chambers with all Commissioners.

Made decision on Employees of the Month for May and June:

- **Tim Perez from Risk Management for May**
- **Chuck Smiley from Public Works Stormwater for June**

Matthew Keough talked about the land exchange with DNR. Josh moved for approval. All 3 in favor – Motioned carried. This will be ratified at the June 8, 2009 Public Meeting.

Nancy presented a resolution allowing the Kingston Village Green Foundation to perform the design, construction, maintenance and operation of the Kingston Village Green. Steve gave brief background. Josh moved the Board approve the resolution. Steve second; all 3 in favor; Approved. Josh suggested that the group give a presentation to show all the work they have been doing at the June 8, 2009 meeting and the Board will ratify the resolution at that time.

Board recessed into executive session from 3:20 – 4:00 pm to discuss potential litigation pursuant to RCW 42.30.110 (1) (i). No action taken.

Respectfully Submitted by Deanna Erstad