Welcome/Meeting Overview
Margaret welcomed everyone to the meeting, which was focused on the preliminary draft environment designations map.

Patty Charnas reported that the Kitsap County Planning Commission has recommended to the Board of Commissioners that the Shoreline Inventory and Characterization be adopted by the Board. The Board will hold a public hearing before they adopt the Inventory and Characterization.

Preliminary Draft Environment Designations Map
Kathlene presented the preliminary draft environment designations, which were developed by DCD staff. The proposed designations are: natural; rural conservancy; urban conservancy; shoreline residential; high-intensity; aquatic. One of these designations is newly added to the designations currently used by Kitsap County. The rest are very similar to what is currently in place, but have been refined and relabeled to conform to new WAC guidelines.

A copy of Kathlene’s presentation can be found at www.kitsapshoreline.org.

In response to suggestions from the Task Force, the shoreline residential designation was modified so that it can be applied both inside and outside the Urban Growth Boundary.
Other changes included clarifying language on certain environmental constraints. Areas with limitations such as floodplains were designated as either rural or urban conservancy. The high-intensity designation was modified to include the Southworth Ferry terminal, which is currently outside of the Urban Growth Area.

A new “aquatic” designation will include the environment from the high tide mark out into the water. Some areas might be “priority aquatic,” meaning they are shorelines of statewide significance, and/or that they have a high ecological function.

**Task Force Discussion on the Preliminary Draft Environment Designations**

Some Task Force members were concerned that the change in designations would be confusing to property owners, and that the rationale for the potential changes had not been clearly articulated. There was also concern expressed that Kitsap County had already pre-determined the changes.

Larry Keeton answered that no decisions have been made on the environment designations. The County has developed the preliminary draft designations, but the Task Force will review all of these proposals and make recommendations on whether or not each of the designations should be put into place as initially proposed by County staff.

In response to questions regarding whether a change in designations was necessary, Patty responded that there are new guidelines and criteria in state law that Kitsap County must respond to and abide by. Elements such as no net loss, cumulative impacts, and restoration plans were not accounted for under the older regulations.

A Task Force member responded with the opinion that new designations might, in fact, enable the permitting process to be accomplished with more accuracy. The designations in the past have pigeon-holed projects because the designations have been too-narrowly defined. However, we should avoid confusion by using the same names as in the past, or use names that are very close to what was used previously.

All agreed that it was important to be able to clearly compare the old vs. the new designations. The County will develop a chart to allow everyone to readily make this side-by-side comparison.

There were about 15-20 minutes of additional Task Force discussion, questions and comments about the work ahead on shoreline environment designations. Members of the Task Force acknowledged that, with the time remaining and available to work on this important and complex section of the SMP, the parameters of what they will focus on are critical to decide upfront.

Comments and discussion items focused on the specific development standards, regulatory provisions and other parcel and project-specific speculations. County staff responded consistently that questions and issues like these will be more specifically framed and established at the upcoming meetings. Since each month will be devoted to an environment designation,
the best way to tackle large and detailed-oriented issues will be at each Task Force meeting and its dedicated time for each individual designation.

Other questions and discussion items dealt with extent of jurisdiction in open water; public versus privately owned tidelands; the documentation of existing conditions, the role of existing zoning, existing ecological functions from the nearshore assessment versus local, evidence-based conditions (e.g., salmon habitat); private versus public lands (military) and the concept of dual designations.

The Task Force was encouraged to read up on the environment designations section of the WAC and to become familiar with the basic management objectives listed under each.

A request to include a shoreline development trends analysis will be considered within existing budget and time constraints.

**SubGroup Work on General Goals and Policies**

Patty suggested that a subgroup be formed from existing Task Force members to assist with the “General Goals and Policies” section of the SMP Update. The Task Force developed its own set of overarching goals earlier in the process, and this second document will use those goals as a starting point. But, the WAC requires more detail than the goals developed by the Task Force. This “sub-group” of the Task Force will work with DCD staff to develop those goals and policies.

Task Force members hearkened back to their first meeting, at which they identified themselves on a spectrum between “no new regulations” and “maximum environmental protection.” Most members portrayed themselves in the middle of the spectrum. The Task Force urged Patty to select a representative sample of the varying perspectives and opinions of members.

**Public Comment**

Three members of the public offered their comments:

- I’m a property owner, and I will need to study the new designations. I’m against the idea of putting a conservancy on private property. I do not support the urban and rural conservancy designations. I don’t know what’s wrong with what we have now. The County should just do a minimal update to the existing plan. If there’s a whole new vocabulary I’ll be very suspicious of it.

- Under the Growth Management Act we have both rural and urban categories. But, the GMA can change at any time and zoning can change at any time. You should not tie this plan into a system that can change at any time. Also, I can’t find the definitions on the map. Next time you print the map you should include the definitions.

- We are sorting through the same process in the Port Orchard SMP. We have found it really helpful to put the old designations right up next to the new ones, to be able to compare them. I recommend that you do that as well.

**Tee Up for March 3**

The focus of the March 3 meeting will be an in-depth discussion on the Natural Designation.