1		KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
2		Zoom Webinar –
3		https://us02web.zoom.us/j/86746453762
4	(OR Dial In: (253) 215-8782 Webinar ID: 867 4645 3762 Password: 826291
5		November 17, 2020 @ 5:30 pm
6 7 8 9 10	moti meet Cour	e minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for ons made, should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the sing. If the reader would like to hear specific discussion, they should visit Kitsap sty's Website at http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm and listen to the ofile (to assist in locating information, time-stamps are provided below).
12 13		<u>bers present</u> : Mike Eliason (Chair), Joe Phillips (Vice Chair), Alan Beam, Amy Maule, Kim , Richard Shattuck, Aaron Murphy, Jim Svensson
14	Mem	bers absent:
15 16		<u>present</u> : Jeff Rimack, Angie Silva, Dave Ward, Liz Williams, Kirvie Mesebeluu-Yobech, nda Walston (Clerk)
17		5:30 pm
18	A.	Introductions
19	В.	Virtual Meeting Protocol
20	c.	Adoption of Agenda
21		MOTION: Kim Allen moves to adopt agenda.
22		SECOND: Joe Phillips
23		 VOTE: 7 in Favor; 0 Opposed – Motion Carries
24	D.	Adoption of Minutes – 10/20/2020
25		Chair Eliason calls for additions or corrections
26 27		• Page 2, line 9, add 'is' after 'overarching goal'; line 28 delete 'with'; page 6, line 34, delete 'no' before substance.
28		Mr. Beam requests draft minutes be distributed sooner.
29 30 31 32 33		 Angie Silva, Department of Community Development (DCD) Assistant Director acknowledges impact of Clerk's workload and responsibilities in addition to the Planning Commission (PC); notes full meeting recordings can be accessed via links posted to the County's PC webpage, generally within one to two business days, for audio and BKAT (Bremerton Kitsap Access Television) video; Draft minutes are

1 2		generally sent to Planning Commissioners for preview one week prior to next regular meeting,
3		MOTION: Mr. Phillips moves to adopt the minutes as amended.
4		SECOND: Jim Svensson
5		 VOTE: 6 in Favor; 1 Abstain; 1 Opposed – Motion Carries
6		5:37 pm
7	E.	General Public Comment
8 9		 Chair Eliason opens the floor to speakers wishing to provide testimony on subjects or items not listed on tonight's agenda.
10		SPEAKER: Bill Palmer
11 12		 Mr. Palmer wishes to provide comments during Agenda item F, the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) update.
13 14		 Chair Eliason notes this item is meant for comment on items not on the agenda; defers to Ms. Silva.
15 16 17 18		 Ms. Silva suggests either a vote to amend the agenda to allow comments during the briefings, or that staff may follow up with Mr. Palmer regarding questions or comments he may have during this agenda item.
19		 Mr. Beam and Mr. Phillips support hearing questions if time allows.
20 21 22 23		 Mr. Shattuck suggests hearing Mr. Palmer's comments now, not during this scheduled briefing; noting there will be additional public comment testimony opportunities for this item during future meetings.
24 25 26		 Ms. Allen concurs with Mr. Shattuck on timing; notes briefings are not appropriate for question/answer sessions and Ms. Silva has noted staff's availability for such an exchange as well.
27 28		 Amy Maule also concurs; noting the intent is to hear general comments for items with no specified comment period.
29 30		 Mr. Svensson also concurs, noting items on the agenda are briefings not public hearings; comments should be shared now.
31 32		 Mr. Murphy also concurs; this would be general public comment, not providing specific testimony.
33		Chair Eliason asks Mr. Palmer to proceed with his comments.
34		5:41

1 Mr. Palmer: Asks the PC and staff, when the public makes comment on the 2 SMP update, does it have bearing on how the update will proceed; comment posed to staff as well as PC. 3 Dick Brown: Has been involved for 50 years as a realtor, developer, builder and 4 5 is greatly concerned about emails and letters between Board of County Commissioners (BoCC), staff and the PC. Has always considered PC to be a 6 7 separate and independent body, if not there is no need to have one. Looking 8 for fresh ideas on housing and does not agree with staff; the PC should 9 cooperate with staff, not be subservient and agree on all issues. PC is 10 intermediary between the public and staff, which has their own agenda that may not be for the public. A housing crisis is taking place right now, PC has to 11 decide how they are going to respond as representative for the public. 12 Comment may be out of bounds but believes no one has spent more time on 13 this than he has. 14 15 Chair Eliason calls for additional comments; hearing none, closes the Floor. 5:45 pm 16 17 F. Briefing: Shoreline Master Program (SMP) Update - Kirvie Mesebeluu-Yobech, 18 Planning & Environmental Programs (PEP) Planner (est. 30 min) Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech presents a brief overview on the project to date, 19 20 noting tasks accomplished and upcoming in Phase 1, including: 21 Presentation and approval of the Public Participation Plan (PPP) by 22 the BoCC on 10/28/2020, which is posted to the Project Website 23 Drafting outreach communication to Tribes, State, other interested 24 agencies, providing for those needing one on one review throughout 25 the process. • Recurring monthly updates on 3rd Thursdays at 5:30 pm begins 26 27 12/17/20, including information on the project and upcoming public 28 engagement opportunities. 29 The Draft Consistency Analysis is in final review stage by staff, goes to 30 the BoCC for their feedback, which will shape the foundation for 31 scope of all proposed code revisions and actions. Essentially this is a multi-page report, based on a summary of review by staff 32 33 and consultants to evaluate consistency of the SMP with State amendments, laws, regulations and gap analysis with local Comprehensive (Comp) Plan and 34 35 development regulations; also an opportunity for staff to look for areas to clarify code, improve predictability and usability for permit applicants and 36 37 review staff. 38 Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager, notes the Department of Ecology (DOE) has a 39 good website for information and guidance on SMP periodic reviews, including 40 a checklist jurisdictions are required to use with a chronology of cumulative

1 2	changes in state law that potentially intersect with SMP and local jurisdictions; there are some inconsistencies now that do need to be fixed.
3 4 5 6 7	• QUESTION: Ms. Allen asks, and Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech confirms, the consistency analysis will be available and posted for view by the public. It is in draft form now, to be presented to the BoCC on 11/25/20. The Project Website is the main repository for all resources and links for the SMP periodic review process and supporting materials.
8 9 10 11 12	 ANSWER: Ms. Silva confirms, the site will be updated with draft amendments or related development regulations as they are proposed, for review and comments; also monthly meetings, administrative changes, DOE guidance on changes and implementation since the last SMP update.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 There is a desire for clarity and improved processes in permit review, such as Shoreline Substantial Development Permits (SSDP) and Shoreline Conditional Use Permits (SCUP), which both currently go before the Hearing Examiner for Decision. Initial discussion with DOE has included suggested process improvement edits, including reducing the SCUP to an Administrative Decision by the Director (Type II); they have ultimate approval but have had generally positive comments so far.
21 22 23	 Ms. Allen notes, and Ms. Silva agrees, that currently, both these permit types require approval by DOE anyway, so that change makes a lot of sense.
24252627	• Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech notes an online open house will be released in December, to coincide with the start of the monthly 3 rd Thursday update meetings, and will be a one stop place with comments, proposal documents, consistency analysis, product results and more.
28 29 30 31 32	 Mr. Ward notes DOE has a fairly prescribed process that provides guidance but also limits flexibility. One unique piece is the larger DOE role in the public engagement process; as Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech noted in the last presentation, there will be a joint PC/DOE public hearing to reduce the number of times people have to appear and speak before going to the BoCC for final hearing.
33	5:58 pm
34 35	• QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Beam asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, staff will send a copy of the consultant contract with scope of work to be done to the PC.
36 37 38 39	• QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Beam asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, once approved by the BoCC, regarding proposed changes; noting the consultant agreement will help provide a general sense of scope and process, while the consistency analysis will help add state and federal guidelines.

1 2		 QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Phillips asks, and Mr. Ward confirms, the presentation from the last meeting will be made available to the PC.
3 4		 QUESTION: Chair Eliason asks if any significant changes have been made to the PPP since the COVID-19 measures were put in place.
5 6 7 8 9		 ANSWER: Mr. Ward notes the previous update was a longer, multi- year process while this review captures changes since then; the PPP is scaled back since it is not the multi-year process, but still provides almost identical opportunities for public review and comment, with both PC and BoCC reviews and public hearing.
10 11 12		 Ms. Mesebeluu-Yobech notes one difference prompted by COVID-19 is that hardcopies provided for review, typically with distribution at public libraries and DCD, are not possible but other accessibility options will be in place.
13		6:03 pm
14 15	G.	Briefing: Buildable Lands Program (BLP) Overview – Liz Williams, PEP Planning Supervisor (est. 30 min)
16 17		 Ms. Williams presents a brief overview regarding the BLP, which will include the Buildable Lands Report (BLR) due on 6/30/21.
18 19 20 21 22		 On 10/27, the County's contractor, BERK Consulting facilitated 1 of 4 coordinating meetings between the County and local jurisdictions, reviewing goals and timelines, sharing examples of findings of review and evaluations. Conversations are high level but did set expectation for jurisdictional agreement on evaluating land supply for presentation in the update and BLR.
23 24		 DCD is working closely with BERK to facilitate regular 1:1 check ins with jurisdictions, which will be needed to meet deadlines.
25 26 27 28 29 30		 Met with BoCC to review PPP and the 1st project announcement goes out this week via GovDelivery, Facebook, Twitter along with additional correspondence to Tribes, Cities, other interested parties and agencies to offer consultation project briefings; coordinating with County Policy team for presentations at upcoming Citizen Advisory Committee meetings; regular project updates will also be provided to the PC.
31 32 33 34		 Work with Cities has been ongoing for several months on look back at development trends to see if County/City growth is consistent with Comp Plans; permit data collection to wrap up soon, which will allow consultant to complete 3rd party review of efforts and provide a recommendation on data.
35 36 37		 Next steps: County staff 1:1 meetings with local jurisdictions begin 12/8/20 for methods on the look forward evaluation of future land supply and work toward discussion, factors, assumptions for land capacity analysis.

1 2 3	 PC review of some of those findings and methodology planned for September; PC is encouraged to visit the project website, which has link to PPP and materials from 10/20/20 PC meeting summary overview.
4	6:09
5 6	 QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Beam asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, staff will send a copy of the consultant contract and scope of work to be done to the PC.
7 8	 QUESTION: Mr. Beam notes the last update landed in Superior Court, asks what steps have been taken to avoid that happening again.
9 10 11 12 13	 ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes this is a heavily litigated element through the Growth Management Act (GMA) and legal is carefully reviewing past case law and new statutory requirements established in 2017 to be sure efforts are data driven and defensible, in anticipation of what may come as a result.
14 15 16	 Chair Eliason notes such scrutiny is expected, as the BoCC years ago allocated nearly a million dollars to defense of litigation of prior comprehensive plan.
17 18 19 20	 Ms. Silva notes intense interaction with Legal attempting to avoid such litigation; a number of cases posted for Puget Sound and other jurisdictions for BLP and other GMA related topics; the staff guide from the Department of Commerce doesn't always spell things out and with this first update the waters haven't been tested yet.
22 23 24 25 26	 Surrounding jurisdictions have also had multiple elements land in Superior Court, Growth Management Hearings Board and even State Supreme Court and there are tendencies to disagree on what the intent of GMA is and was, but local jurisdictions must be in agreement for this program and the County will do our best to defend assumptions and how we achieve growth targets, other items.
28 29 30	 Mr. Beam asks if there is a specific timeline for annexations to be completed, and whether the BLR will address that, as the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) have not been updated in some time.
31 32 33 34 35 36	 Ms. Silva notes they are reviewed in evaluation periods, such as the current look at 2019 permit trends in Port Orchard and McCormick area where lots were created, but zones were modified; review needed to determine if we are achieving densities specified in policy; also what measures are in place and if reasonable along with what must be adjusted or implemented in the 2024 Comp Plan update.
37	6:18 pm

H. For the Good of the Order/Commissioner Comments

38

1 2		nair Eliason notes there are some items planned in advance; will call for Iditional comments later
3	• <u>Bri</u>	iefing on Annual Meeting with the Board of County Commissioners
4 5 6 7 8		 Chair Eliason notes he was satisfied with the process and outcome; appreciated Commissioner Garrido's engaging with each commissioner on their thoughts; Commissioner Gelder restated that county email is to be used for communications; Commissioner Wolfe emphasized the purpose of the PC.
9 10 11		 PC requested clarification on the Public Participation Work Group; Commissioner Gelder responded on 11/13 via email addressing roles and responsibilities of PC, with some clarification on Work Groups.
12	• <u>Re</u>	port of the Public Participation Work Group
13 14		 Chair Eliason notes when proposed, the intent was for completion by 12/30/20; one of the next two meetings will allow for that report out.
15 16 17 18 19 20 21		 Chair Eliason notes Commissioner Gelder's stated 'please do limit the discussion to PC members and focus on proposals that will benefit DCDs efforts' in his clarification email; the Work Group reaching out to stakeholders would be a helpful step to get recommendations and focus on enhancing staff efforts; but he interprets Commissioner Gelder to say the group can reach out for resources, but not contact stakeholders or engage external groups.
22 23 24		 Mr. Phillips does not see the purpose of the group if it cannot reach out to the public; it doesn't make sense if they can't get people's perception of the PC and see what can be done.
25 26 27 28		 Mr. Shattuck believes the group can still do good work within that; group has done some initial data collection, with Mr. Beam reaching out to the Department of Commerce; we can still look at outside resources to find concepts, generate ideas that have worked there.
29 30 31		 Mr. Beam notes the PC charter is to represent the public, the stormwater manual had two people comment; if we can enhance public comment, it is important to discuss.
32 33 34 35 36		 Chair Eliason notes within confines, data collection without engaging the public can still happen; bring your own ideas forward to the PC, to decide what to recommend to staff; agrees with Mr. Phillips; notes comments come through staff, but individuals don't come to the PC and wonders why.
37 38 39		 Mr. Murphy asks what can or cannot be done legally, such as, could I ask the Director of the Home Builder's Association, as an individual? Where is that line we do not want to cross?

1	 Chair Eliason notes the Open Public Meeting Act has to do with the
2	number of members engaged or included.
3	 Mr. Phillips asks how going to different groups to get ideas and then
4	boiling them down to present a recommendation to the PC violates
5	the Public Meetings act and would like to hear legal opinion.
6	 Ms. Silva suggests the PC request additional clarification on this email,
7	as the interpretation that the PC members can't reach out may not be
8	the intent; for example her interpretation would that this is more
9	about limiting the membership of the work group, but doesn't see it
10	as no reaching out to other groups allowed; maybe ask for specifics.
11	 Often, other agencies are used to a government to government
12	model, where communication flows through staff or other
13	department contacts; we engage groups throughout the process,
14	including stakeholders; they choose whether to attend the hearings
15	or submit directly to the staff leading that project, or both.
16	 Chair Eliason asks, and Ms. Silva confirms she will ask Commissioner
17	Gelder for clarification and bring back to the PC, after which the Work
18	Group can decide how to proceed.
19	6:35 pm
20	 Recognition of Retiring Planning Commissioners
21	 Chair Eliason and members of the PC express appreciation for the
22	service of Mr. Shattuck, Mr. Svensson and Ed Galliway.
23	 Mr. Ward and Ms. Silva express appreciation, on behalf of the
24	Department, for their service as well.
25	• <u>Training Opportunities – Short Course on Local Planning (Dept of Commerce)</u>
26	 Ms. Silva notes the Clerk recently sent opportunities and topics
27	available to the PC, with a link to website for Department of
28	Commerce, which hosts the Short Course on Local Planning.
29	 A presentation by the Legal Department on changes and case law
30	updates will also be coming, possibly timed to coincide with incoming
31	new PC members.
32	• 2021 Regular Meeting Calendar
33	 Ms. Silva notes proposed calendar from Clerk reflects changes to
34	dates with known conflicts
35	 Chair Eliason asks, and Ms. Silva agrees to check with legal for
36	clarification on whether approval is needed for proposed changes
37	with variation to typical 1 st and 3 rd Tuesday meetings.

1	 2021 Chair & Vice Chair Elections
2 3 4 5	 Chair Eliason notes elections are coming up; noting agenda setting meetings have been helpful, staff is very supportive and even with changes like virtual meetings this year, encourages fellow PC members to consider.
6	
7	Time of Adjournment: 6:57 pm
8	
9	Minutes approved this15th_ day ofDecember2020.
10	
11	Michael ?
12	Mike Eliason, Planning Commission Chair
13	1 000
14	_ UManusacos I
15	Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Clerk
16	