

Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

The Kitsap Peninsula is the home of sovereign Indian nations. namely the Suguamish and Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribes.

KRCC Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC) Meeting Agenda

Meeting Date: September 14, 2023 **Meeting Timing:** 9:30 – 11:30 a.m.

Remote Participation: There are two options for remotely participating in this meeting.

- Option A Video Conferencing and Screen Sharing. Please click the following link: https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86163692485.
- Option B Call in only. If you are not by a computer, you can join by phone only. Please call (253) 215-8782 and then enter the meeting number: 861 6369 2485 to enter the call. You do not need a participant ID, just press "#" to continue the call.

Main Meeting Objectives:

- Discuss candidate countywide centers.
- Begin developing KRCC land use program for 2024.

1. Welcome

2 Old Rusiness

| | Old Business | |
|----|--|--------|
| | a. ACTION: Approve the draft April 27 Meeting Summary | Page 2 |
| | and the state of t | |
| | | |
| 3. | Committee Updates and Work in Progress | |
| _ | | Daga C |
| | a. Discuss candidate countywide centers | Page 6 |

| b. | Revisit 2022 adjustments to population and employment targets | Page 16 |
|----|---|----------|
| | Check in about updating baseline number consistently across jurisdictions | 1 101 -1 |
| d. | Discuss Draft 2024 Land Use Program | Page 18 |

4. Administrative Agenda

- a. Meeting Review
 - 2023 Land Use Meeting Plan Page 22
 - Next scheduled LUTAC meeting: November 9

5. Wrap Up

Recap topics covered and summarize key decisions and action items

6. Adjourn



Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC) April 27, 2023 Meeting Summary | Convened via Teleconference

Draft v. 5/10/23

| De | Decisions and Recommendations | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------|----------|
| | LUTAC recommended cancelling the May 11 LUTAC meeting | 5. | |
| Act | ions | Person Responsible | Status |
| 1. | Schedule a KRCC orientation meeting with Carol Holman. | KRCC Staff | Complete |
| 2. | Schedule a KRCC orientation meeting with HB Harper. | KRCC Staff | Complete |
| 3. | Upload the approved March 9 and March 23 LUTAC meeting summaries to the KRCC website. | KRCC Staff | Complete |
| 4. | Ask the Executive Committee to clarify the intended outcomes of the discussion with legislators at the June 6 KRCC Board meeting. | KRCC Staff | Complete |
| 5. | Cancel the May 11 LUTAC meeting. | KRCC Staff | Complete |

1. Welcome and Introductions

Sophie Glass, KRCC staff, welcomed LUTAC members to the April 27 meeting. Sophie reviewed the meeting objectives and topics. Attachment A lists the LUTAC members and other presenters in attendance.

Carol Holman, Department of Commerce, introduced herself. Carol recently joined Commerce and is taking over technical assistance work for the Kitsap region. KRCC staff offered to hold an orientation meeting with Carol to share background information about KRCC.

2. Old Business

a. Meeting Summary Review: LUTAC members reviewed the March 9 and March 23 meeting summaries. They did not raise any comments or concerns. KRCC staff will post the summaries to the KRCC website.

3. Committee Updates and Work in Progress

a. Debrief April 18 KRCC PlanPOL Meeting: Sophie reminded LUTAC members that during the April 18 PlanPOL meeting, PlanPOL recommended moving the draft housing allocations forward to the KRCC Board.

LUTAC members emphasized the importance of using the language "housing allocation" rather than "target."

Sophie shared that KRCC staff can present the same slides from the PlanPOL meeting to the KRCC Board during its May 2 meeting. LUTAC members agreed with this approach.

b. Discuss Information from Commerce Regarding Guidance Documents: Valerie Smith shared that Commerce has not made any updates to its guidance since the previous LUTAC meeting.

Commerce is currently working on developing a checklist for updating Comprehensive Plans, which will include requirements from HB 1220.

LUTAC members asked the following questions:

- Many of the HB 1220-related documents on Commerce's webpage still have "draft" watermarks. When does Commerce expect that final versions of these documents will be released?
 - Final guidance will be consolidated into a final guidance book, which Commerce expects to release near the end of May.
- Kitsap County is continuing the conversation with Commerce regarding the
 relationship between housing allocations and population targets. In response to this
 conversation, Commerce has included information about exceeding population
 targets into a draft Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document. What is the status
 of the information in this document becoming public?
 - Commerce staff will check with their housing policy team to determine the status of this FAQ document.
- Should land capacity for showing that a jurisdiction has met the housing allocations be calculated only based on what is permitted outright as a base? Some jurisdictions have mechanisms, such as Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) programs that could increase capacity if they are used, but that may not be used every time.
 - There is flexibility in terms of local incentives that are allowed but not necessarily utilized often, as long as jurisdictions show their work in determining capacity.
 - LUTAC members requested additional details and parameters about this topic in Commerce's guidance documents.
- What is Commerce's approach for developing guidance regarding new requirements from HB 1110 and HB 1181?
 - Commerce plans to hire new staff to work on housing, climate, and salmon recovery work based on the bills that came out of the legislative session. The state budget includes funding for these new staff, as well as grants for jurisdictions to conduct this work.
- Will jurisdictions with Comprehensive Plans due at the end of 2024 be required to incorporate updated requirements from HB 1181 during this Comprehensive Plan update?
 - Commerce will work internally to interpret HB 1181 and clarify how it applies to jurisdictions that are updating their Comprehensive Plans by 2024.
- Many jurisdictions are struggling with staffing. Will any of the available grants be able to be used to hire additional staff?
 - Jurisdictions have the flexibility to use certain grants in whichever way works best for them. However, many grants are deliverable based and may not be able to be used to hire staff.
- c. Discuss Request to Attend June 6 KRCC Board Meeting: Sophie explained that the KRCC Executive Committee has begun planning for the June 6 KRCC Board meeting, which KRCC has invited legislators to attend. The Executive Committee shared that legislators do not fully understand the impact of the bills that come out of the legislature on jurisdictions' planning staff. They requested that LUTAC members attend the meeting and speak directly to legislators, and asked LUTAC to discuss potential approaches for this discussion.

LUTAC members shared the following feedback regarding the legislative session:



- The 2023 legislative session had a particularly large number of housing and land use bills, which required significant analysis and review by jurisdictions' staff. This decreased the resources available to conduct jurisdictions' typical work, such as permitting.
- With new legislation coming through each year, it is difficult to see the impact of
 previous changes before having to add new changes. It would be better to allow time
 for new legislation to play out and see the outcomes before adding more legislation.
- Jurisdictions that are not able to hire lobbyists struggle to engage in dialogue with legislators.
- The Growth Management Act focuses on bottom-up planning. New legislation takes a top-down approach. This mismatch of policy approaches creates significant challenges for implementation.
- Jurisdictions struggle to implement new legislation due to insufficient staffing and funding. Even when legislation comes with funding, jurisdictions have struggled to find available staff or consultants.

LUTAC members shared the following considerations regarding the approach for the June 6 Board meeting:

- It is important to provide honest feedback to legislators so they understand how difficult jurisdictions' work has been.
- It is important for this conversation to be productive and have a clear outcome that is focused on improving future legislative sessions.

LUTAC members requested that KRCC staff ask the Executive Committee to clarify the goals of this discussion with the legislators. During the May 25 LUTAC meeting, LUTAC can discuss and confirm the approach for the dialogue with legislators.

4. Administrative Agenda

a. Meeting Review:

• 2023 Land Use Meeting Plan: Sophie reviewed the 2023 land use meeting plan. LUTAC members recommended cancelling the May 11 LUTAC meeting and focusing the May 25 LUTAC meeting on preparing for the dialogue with legislators.

LUTAC members requested that KRCC staff stay in touch with Commerce so that Commerce can present at future LUTAC meetings once their guidance is complete.

HB Harper requested an orientation meeting with KRCC staff to help her understand KRCC's land use work plan once the housing allocation work is complete. KRCC staff will schedule an orientation meeting.

5. Wrap Up

a. Recap: Sophie reviewed the decisions and action items listed in the table above.

6. Adjourn

Attachment A: List of LUTAC Members in Attendance (Virtual Participation Only)

| Name | Affiliation (alphabetical) |
|-----------------------------|---|
| 1. HB Harper | City of Bainbridge Island |
| 2. Andrea Spencer | City of Bremerton |
| 3. Jim Fisk | City of Port Orchard |
| 4. Heather Wright | City of Poulsbo |
| 5. Eric Baker | Kitsap County |
| 6. Ed Coviello | Kitsap Transit |
| 7. Nicole Leaptrot-Figueras | Naval Base Kitsap |
| 8. James Weaver | Port of Bremerton |
| 9. Erika Harris | Puget Sound Regional Council |
| 10. Carol Holman | Washington State Department of Commerce |
| 11. Valerie Smith | Washington State Department of Commerce |
| 12. Debbie Clemen | Washington State Department of Transportation |
| 13. Yvette Liufau | Washington State Department of Transportation |
| | |
| Sophie Glass | KRCC Program Director |
| Pauline Mogilevsky | KRCC Land Use Program Lead |

Appendix C: Centers of Growth

Reference document: March 22, 2018 PSRC Regional Centers Framework Update

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf

Table C-1: Regional Growth Centers*

| | Regional Growth Centers | | |
|---------------------------|--|--|--|
| Description | Description Regional Growth Centers are locations of more compact, pedestrian | | |
| • | oriented development with a mix of housing, jobs, retail, services, and | | |
| | other destinations. Centers receive a significant share of the region's | | |
| | population and employment growth compared with other parts of the | | |
| | urban areas while providing improved access and mobility – especially | | |
| | for walking, biking, and transit. | | |
| Types | Metro Growth Center: These Centers have a primary regional role, | | |
| • | with dense existing housing and jobs, transit service and are planning | | |
| | for significant growth and will continue to serve as major transit hubs | | |
| | for the region. These Centers also provide regional services and serve | | |
| | as major civic and cultural centers. | | |
| | Urban Growth Center: These Centers have an important regional | | |
| | role, with dense existing jobs and housing, transit service and planning | | |
| | for significant growth. These Centers may represent areas where | | |
| | major investments – such as high-capacity transit – offer new | | |
| | opportunities for growth. | | |
| Location | New Regional Growth Centers should be located within a city and | | |
| | unincorporated urban growth area under certain circumstances. | | |
| Designation | KRCC designates as candidate in Appendix D. | | |
| O | PSRC designates; must meet PSRC criteria and designation | | |
| | procedures. | | |
| Prioritization | Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or | | |
| | functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) | | |
| | that meets PSRC guidance prior to designation. | | |
| | Environmental review that demonstrates the center area is | | |
| | appropriate for dense development. | | |
| | Assessment of housing need and documentation to provide | | |
| | housing choices affordable to a full range of incomes and | | |
| | strategies. | | |
| Doneity | Urban Growth Center | | |
| Density | | | |
| | o Existing density of 18 activity units per acre minimum | | |
| | o Planned target density of 45 activity units per acre | | |
| | minimum Matra Granth Contar | | |
| | Metro Growth Center Finding description of 20 activities with a second single control of the control | | |
| | Existing density of 30 activity units per acre minimum | | |
| | Planned target density of 85 activity units per acre | | |
| 0.1 5 | minimum | | |
| Other Requirements | • Local Commitment: Evidence the RGC is a local priority and | | |
| | sustained commitment to local investment in creating a walkable, | | |
| | livable center is demonstrated. | | |

| | Mix of Uses: Goal for a minimum mix of at least 15% planned residential and employment activity in the RGC. Market Potential: Evidence of future market potential to support planned target. Role: Evidence of regional role for RGC, i.e. serves as important destination for the county, city center of metropolitan cities, other large and fast-growing centers. Jurisdiction is planning to accommodate significant residential and |
|---------------|---|
| | employment growth under PSRC Regional Growth Strategy. |
| | Bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure, amenities and a street pattern that supports walkability. |
| Size and | Urban Growth Centers: |
| Configuration | 200 acres minimum and 640 acres maximum (may be larger under specific circumstances) |
| | Metro Growth Centers: |
| | 320 acres minimum and 640 acres maximum (may be larger under specific circumstances) |
| | Nodal with a generally round or square shape, avoiding linear or gerrymandered shapes that are not readily walkable or connected by transit. |
| Transit** | Urban Growth Centers: |
| | Existing or planned fixed route bus, regional bus, Bus Rapid Transit, or other frequent and all-day bus service. May substitute high-capacity transit mode for fixed route bus. |
| | Metro Growth Centers: |
| | Existing or planned light rail, commuter rail, ferry or other high capacity transit with similar service quality as light rail. |
| | Evidence the area serves as major transit hub and has high quality/high capacity existing or planned service. |

^{*} All criteria is as set forth in PSRC 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; no additional criteria established in Table C-1. See PSRC information on Regional Growth Centers:

 $\underline{https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/centers designation procedures.pdf}$

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/centerschecklist.pdf;

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf

^{**} Transit for RGCs has specific criteria as outlined in the 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; please refer to Framework for specific transit criteria.

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} Table C-2: & Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (MIC)* \\ \end{tabular}$

| | Manufacturing/Industrial Centers | |
|----------------|---|--|
| Description | Manufacturing/Industrial Centers preserve lands for family-wage jobs in basic industries and trade and provide areas where employment may grow in the future. Manufacturing/Industrial Centers form a critical regional resource that provides economic diversity, supports national and international trade, generates substantial revenue and offers higher than average wages. | |
| Types | Industrial Employment Center: These Centers are highly active industrial areas with significant existing jobs, core industrial activity, evidence of long-term demand, and regional role. They have a legacy of industrial employment and represent important long-term industrial areas, such as deep-water ports and major manufacturing. The intent of this designation is to, at a minimum, preserve existing industrial jobs and land use and to continue to grow industrial employment in these Centers were possible. Jurisdictions and transit agencies should aim to serve with transit. | |
| | Industrial Growth Center: These regional clusters of industrial lands have significant value to the region and potential for job growth. These large areas of industrial land serve the region with international employers, industrial infrastructure, concentrations of industrial jobs, and evidence of long-term potential. The intent of this designation is to continue growth of industrial employment and preserve the region's industrial land base for long-term growth and retention. Jurisdictions and transit agencies should aim to serve with public transit. | |
| Location | Manufacturing/Industrial centers should be located within a city with few exceptions. | |
| Designation | KRCC designates as candidate in Appendix D. PSRC designates; must meet PSRC criteria and designation procedures. | |
| Prioritization | Completion of a center plan (subarea plan, plan element or functional equivalent that provides detailed planning or analysis) that meets PSRC guidance prior to designation. Where applicable, the plan should be developed in consultation with public ports and other affected governmental entities. Environmental review that the area is appropriate for development. | |
| Criteria | Industrial Employment Center 10,000 minimum existing jobs 20,000 minimum planned jobs Minimum 50% industrial employment Presence of irreplaceable industrial infrastructure Minimum 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses Industrial Growth Center Minimum size of 2,000 acres 4,000 minimum existing jobs | |

| | o 10,000 minimum planned jobs | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| | o Minimum 50% industrial employment | |
| | Minimum 75% of land area zoned for core industrial uses | |
| Other Requirements | Local Commitment: Evidence the MIC is a local priority and has | |
| _ | sustained commitment overtime to investments in infrastructure | |
| | and transportation, and sustainability of industrial uses. | |
| | Industrial retention strategies are in place. | |
| | Serves a regional role for employment. | |
| Transit | If MIC is in a transit service district, availability of existing or | |
| | planned frequent, local, express or flexible transit service. | |
| | If MIC is outside of a transit service district, documented | |
| | strategies to reduce commute impacts through transportation | |
| | demand management strategies consistent with Regional | |
| | Transportation Plan Appendix F (Regional TDM Action Plan). | |
| Existing Conditions | Adequate infrastructure and utilities to support growth, access to | |
| | relevant transportation infrastructure, documentation of economic | |
| | impact, and justification of size and shape of center. | |

^{*} All criteria is as set forth in PSRC 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; no additional criteria established in Table C-2. See PSRC information on Manufacturing/Industrial Centers:

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/centersdesignationprocedures.pdf

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/centerschecklist.pdf

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final regional centers framework march 22 version.pdf

Table C-3: Countywide Growth Centers

| Countywide Growth Centers | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|
| Description | Countywide Growth Centers serve important roles as places for | |
| | concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreation opportunities. | |
| | These are areas linked by transit, provide a mix of housing and | |
| | services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment. | |
| Identification | Identified as a Countywide Growth Center in the local | |
| | comprehensive plan. | |
| | Identified in Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies | |
| | Appendix D. | |
| Prioritization | Subarea plan may be developed for the Center. | |
| | If a subarea plan is not prepared, policies and infrastructure | |
| | analysis shall be incorporated into the local comprehensive plan.* | |
| Existing Conditions | At the time of identification, the center shall have: | |
| | An existing activity unit (AU) density of 10 AU/acre. | |
| | Located within a city or unincorporated urban growth area. | |
| | An existing planning and zoning designation for a mix of uses of | |
| | 20% residential and 20% employment. | |
| | A capacity and planning for additional growth. | |
| Size and | • 160 acres minimum and 500 acres maximum. | |
| Configuration | A smaller sized Countywide Growth Center may be | |
| | approved if the jurisdiction demonstrates within its | |
| | comprehensive plan or subarea plan: * | |

| | Meets all other criteria (i.e. activity units, mix of uses, capacity for additional growth); and The Center is within a walkshed with pedestrian connectivity that lacks barriers, and is approximate ½ mile wide and long; or The Center encompasses area(s) that fall within a ¼ mile radii from an existing or planned transit service; or The Center encompasses area(s) that fall within a ¼ mile radii from an existing or planned ferry terminal. Recommended centers are generally round or square, although other configurations are acceptable if overall the center configuration supports the planned growth and are walkable and/or connected by transit. | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Multimodal | Served by multi-modal transportation, including: | |
| Considerations | Transit service, including ferries (foot and vehicle) * | |
| | Pedestrian infrastructure | |
| | Street pattern that supports walkability | |
| | Bicycle infrastructure and amenities | |
| Other Requirements | | |
| | gross acre, as defined by PSRC; calculation of activity units shall | |
| | be completed by PSRC or other acceptable methodology proposed | |
| | by the jurisdiction. * | |

^{*}Table X-3 Countywide Centers of Growth criteria is as set forth in PSRC 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; criteria identified with an * and in italics is additional criteria specific to Kitsap CPP Appendix C. https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf

Table C-4Countywide Industrial Centers*

| | Countywide Industrial Centers | |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| Description | Countywide Industrial Centers serve as important local industrial | |
| | areas that support living wage jobs and serve a key role in the | |
| | county's manufacturing/industrial economy. | |
| Identification | Identified as a Countywide Growth Center in the local | |
| | comprehensive plan. | |
| | Identified in Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies | |
| | Appendix D. | |
| Prioritization | Subarea plan may be developed for the Center. | |
| | If a subarea plan is not prepared, policies and infrastructure | |
| | analysis, including identification of investment priority of the | |
| | Center, shall be incorporated into the local comprehensive plan. | |
| Existing Conditions | At the time of identification, the Center shall have: | |
| | • A minimum of 1,000 existing jobs, and/or a minimum of 500 | |
| | acres of industrial zoning. | |
| | Defined transportation demand management strategies in | |
| | place. | |

| | At least 75% of the center zoned for core industrial uses. Existing capacity and planning for additional employment growth. | |
|--------------------|--|--|
| Other Requirements | | |
| _ | Have industrial retention strategies in place. | |
| | Play an important county role and concentration of industrial | |
| | land or jobs with evidence of long-term demand. | |

^{*} All criteria as set forth in PSRC 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; no additional criteria established in Table C-4. https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final regional centers framework march 22 version.pdf

Table C-5: Local Centers

| Local Centers | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Description | Local Centers are central places that support communities. These | | | | | | | | | | |
| | places range from neighborhood centers to active crossroads and play | | | | | | | | | | |
| | an important role in the region. Local centers help define community | | | | | | | | | | |
| | character and usually provide as local gathering places and | | | | | | | | | | |
| | community hubs; they also can be suitable for additional growth and | | | | | | | | | | |
| | focal points for services. As local centers grow, they may become | | | | | | | | | | |
| | eligible for designation as a countywide or regional center. | | | | | | | | | | |
| Identification | Identified in local comprehensive plans. | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Not identified in Countywide Planning Policies. | | | | | | | | | | |

^{*} All criteria as set forth in 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; no additional criteria established in Table C-5. https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final regional centers framework march 22 version.pdf

Table C-6: Military Installations

| Military Installations | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Description | Military Installations are a vital part of the region, home to thousands | | | | | | | |
| | of personnel and jobs, and a major contributor to the region's | | | | | | | |
| | economy. While military installations are not subject to local, | | | | | | | |
| | regional or state plans and regulations, Kitsap local governments and | | | | | | | |
| | Tribes recognize the relationship between regional growth patterns | | | | | | | |
| | and military installations, and the importance of how military | | | | | | | |
| | employment and personnel affect all aspects of regional planning. | | | | | | | |
| Types/Designation | Major Military Installations are defined as installations with | | | | | | | |
| | more than 5,000 enlisted and service personnel. | | | | | | | |
| | Smaller Military Installations are specified by RCW | | | | | | | |
| | 36.70A.530 and identifies them as federal military | | | | | | | |
| | installations, other than a reserve center, that employs 100 or | | | | | | | |
| | more full-time personnel. | | | | | | | |
| Identification | Identified in Comprehensive Plan of jurisdiction is located. | | | | | | | |
| | Identified in Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies | | | | | | | |
| | Appendix D. | | | | | | | |

Other Requirements

- Military Installations may be considered countywide centers or equivalent as allowed by 2018 Centers Framework Update in order to ensure*:
 - Freight routing and mobility into and between the military installations;
 - Accessibility and connectivity to transportation corridors;
 - Safety, accessibility and mobility conditions where freight and passenger transportation systems interact.
- The identification of a Military Installation as a countywide center or equivalent shall not be used as justification or support urban levels of densities if the MI is not located within an urban growth area.*

Table C-6 Military Installations criteria is as set forth in PSRC 2018 Regional Growth Framework Update; criteria identified with an * is additional criteria specific to Kitsap CPP Appendix C.

https://www.psrc.org/sites/default/files/final_regional_centers_framework_march_22_version.pdf

Appendix D:List of Centers 2021

| Regional Growth Centers and Manufacturing/Industrial Centers (PSRC designated) | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Jurisdiction | Regional Center Name | Regional Center Type | | | | | | | |
| City of Bremerton | Bremerton | Metro Center | | | | | | | |
| Kitsap County | Silverdale | Urban Center | | | | | | | |
| City of Bremerton | Puget Sound Industrial Center | Manufacturing/Industrial | | | | | | | |
| | - Bremerton | Growth Center (MIC) | | | | | | | |
| Candidate Regional Growth | Candidate Regional Growth Center or Manufacturing/Industrial Center | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Countywide Centers | | | | | | | | | |
| Jurisdiction | Countywide Center Name | Countywide Center Type | | | | | | | |
| Kitsap County | Kingston | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| Kitsap County | McWilliams/SR 303 | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| City of Bremerton | Charleston DCC Center | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| City of Bremerton | | | | | | | | | |
| | (previously Harrison | | | | | | | | |
| | Hospital) | | | | | | | | |
| City of Port Orchard | Downtown Port Orchard | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| Candidate Countywide Cente | | | | | | | | | |
| City of Port Orchard | Ruby Creek | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| City of Port Orchard | Mile Hill | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| City of Port Orchard | Sedgwick/Bethel Center | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| City of Poulsbo | Downtown Poulsbo/SR 305 | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| | Corridor | | | | | | | | |
| City of Bainbridge Island | Winslow | Growth Center | | | | | | | |
| Military Installations | Military Installation Name | Type of Installation | | | | | | | |
| Bremerton | Naval Base Kitsap – | Major Installation | | | | | | | |
| | Bremerton | | | | | | | | |
| Bremerton | Naval Base Kitsap – Jackson | Smaller Installation | | | | | | | |
| | Park | | | | | | | | |
| Kitsap County | Naval Base Kitsap – Bangor | Major Installation | | | | | | | |
| Kitsap County | Naval Base Kitsap - Keyport | Smaller Installation | | | | | | | |

D-1 Centers Designation Process shall occur as set forth below:

a. Appendix D - List of Centers 2021:

i. The Countywide Centers identified in Appendix D – List of Centers 2021 are those Growth Centers that are: 1) identified in previous Kitsap CPP Appendix F or identified in a comprehensive or subarea plan by April 2020; and 2) where planning (comprehensive or subarea) has been completed by the jurisdiction, and 3) which meets the criteria of a countywide Center and is intended to accommodate a concentration of the 2024 growth targets. A review and confirmation of the identified Countywide Centers will occur as part of the 2024 GMA Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update, as set forth below, and consistent with Policy C-4.b.

b. As part of 2024 GM Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update:

- i. Jurisdictions have identified Candidate Centers in Table D-1, locations which it anticipates a concentration of its residential and employment growth target will be accommodated for its 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update.
- ii. Jurisdictions shall complete planning for each Candidate Center as part of its 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan Update, consistent with Policy C-4.b and Appendix C.
- iii. Centers not listed as Candidate Centers in Table D-1 may also be proposed for identification as a Center, if during the jurisdiction's 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update process, a different or additional locations were identified and planning consistent with Policy C-4.b was completed.
- iv. After adoption of jurisdiction's 2024 GMA Comprehensive Plan Update, KRCC shall invite jurisdictions by second quarter 2025 to submit comprehensive plan chapters/sections or subarea plans for review to convert the candidate status to full Countywide Center status. An application, checklist or other tool may be created by KRCC to aid evaluation and confirmation.
- v. Members of PlanPol or other designated subcommittee shall review the submitted comprehensive plan sections or subarea plans and provide recommendation to the full KRCC Board
- vi. KRCC Board shall finalize Centers designations by amending Appendix D, and adoption and ratification follows the amendment process established in Appendix A.

c. Prior to 2024 GMA Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update:

- i. A jurisdiction may request the KRCC Board consider a full Center designation (i.e. a conversion from candidate to full Center, or propose a new Center) prior to the 2024 GMA Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update process (identified in D-1.b) in order to recognize planning the jurisdiction has completed.
 - a. The comprehensive plan chapter/section or subarea plan must demonstrate that the proposed Center meets the criteria and requirements of the 2018 Centers Framework Update and Appendix C.
 - b. The comprehensive plan chapter/section or subarea plan must demonstrate that the proposed Center is planned and has capacity to accommodate a concentration of the jurisdiction's residential and employment growth targets.
- ii. The jurisdiction may request annually by February 15th prior to 2025 for consideration by the KRCC Board. An application, checklist or other tool may be created by KRCC to aid evaluation and confirmation.
- iii. Members of PlanPol or other designated subcommittee shall review the submitted subarea plans and provide recommendation to the full KRCC Board.
- iv. KRCC Board shall vote on Centers designation amendment(s) to Appendix D, and adoption and ratification follows the amendment process established in Appendix A.

d. After the 2024 GMA Periodic Comprehensive Plan Update:

- i. Centers designations are generally on an eight-year cycle consistent GMA periodic update; growth forecasting and distribution; or when necessary, a five-year cycle consistent with PSRC's major plan update(s).
- ii. After the finalization of Center designations in 2025, jurisdictions may request new Centers be designated upon a circumstance authorized by Policy C-4.a.
- iii. A jurisdiction may request a new center designation during a planned update to the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies, or outside of a planned update subject to approval of the KRCC Executive Board-

- iv. An application, checklist or other tool may be created by KRCC to aid evaluation of a new proposed center.
- v. Members of PlanPol or other designated subcommittee shall review the submitted comprehensive plan and/or subarea plan and provide recommendation to the full KRCC Board.
- vi. KRCC Board shall finalize Centers designations by amending Appendix D, and adoption and ratification follows the amendment process established in Appendix A.

Appendix B-1: Population Distribution Through 2044

| Jurisdiction | 2020 Population (US Census) | 2020-2044 Population Growth | 2044 Population Target | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Metropolitan | Cities | | | | | | | | |
| Bremerton | Bremerton 43,505 20,252 63,757 | | | | | | | | | |
| Bremerton UGA | 10,105 | 2,762 | 12,867 | | | | | | | |
| | Core City | | | | | | | | | |
| Silverdale | 19,675 | 9,896 | 29,571 | | | | | | | |
| | High-Capacity Transi | t Communities | | | | | | | | |
| Bainbridge Island | 24,825 | 4,524 | 29,349 | | | | | | | |
| Kingston | 2,435 | 3,200 | 5,635 | | | | | | | |
| Port Orchard | 15,587 | 10,500 | 26,087 | | | | | | | |
| Port Orchard UGA | 15,370 | 3,552 | 18,922 | | | | | | | |
| Poulsbo | 11,975 | 4,581 | 16,556 | | | | | | | |
| Poulsbo UGA | 528 | 1,065 | 1,593 | | | | | | | |
| | Urban Unincon | porated | | | | | | | | |
| Central Kitsap UGA | 24,741 | 5,000 | 29,741 | | | | | | | |
| Rural Areas | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rural | 106,865 | 5,415 | 112,280 | | | | | | | |

 $Source: 2020 \ Census \ Redistricting \ File, PSRC \ 2018 \ Regional \ Forecast, \ VISION \ 2050 \ regional \ growth \ strategy \ adopted \ per \ General \ Assembly \ action \ 10-30-2020$

During a Comprehensive Plan review process, a city and its associated UGA may transfer population and employment between the two jurisdictions with approval by elected bodies from both jurisdictions, while not exceeding the overall targets. KRCC shall update the CPPs via an amendment after these changes are complete. See UGA-5 i for more details and information.

Appendix B-2: Employment Distribution Through 2044

| Jurisdiction | 2020 Employment (US Census) | 2020-2044 Employment Growth | 2044 Employment Target | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Metropolitan | Cities | | | | | | | | |
| Bremerton 44,083* 14,175 58,258 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bremerton UGA | 1,401 | 2,434 | 3,835 | | | | | | | |
| | Core City | | | | | | | | | |
| Silverdale | 13,281 | 11,416 | 24,697 | | | | | | | |
| | High-Capacity Transit Communities | | | | | | | | | |
| Bainbridge Island | 9,176 | 1,927 | 11,103 | | | | | | | |
| Kingston | 1,077 | 1,400 | 2,477 | | | | | | | |
| Port Orchard | 8,562 | 5,400 | 13,962 | | | | | | | |
| Port Orchard UGA | 2,683 | 1,500 | 4,183 | | | | | | | |
| Poulsbo | 7,638 | 3,903 | 11,541 | | | | | | | |
| Poulsbo UGA | 78 | 97 | 175 | | | | | | | |
| | Urban Unincor | porated | | | | | | | | |
| Central Kitsap UGA | 1,470 | 5,455 | | | | | | | | |
| | Rural Are | eas | | | | | | | | |
| Rural | 22,896* | 2,301 | 25,197 | | | | | | | |

Source: 2020 Census Redistricting File, PSRC Employment Database PSRC 2018 Regional Forecast, VISION 2050 regional growth strategy adopted per General Assembly action 10-30-2020

During a Comprehensive Plan review process, a city and its associated UGA may transfer population and employment between the two jurisdictions with approval by elected bodies from both jurisdictions, while not exceeding the overall targets. KRCC shall update the CPPs via an amendment after these changes are complete. See UGA-5 i for more details and information.

^{*} Represents all employment including jobs covered and not covered under the WA State Unemployment Insurance Program. Represents uniformed military personnel assigned to major regional installations (per VISION 2050).

^{*} Note: In the City of Bremerton, 7,982 of 44,083 jobs in 2020 are held by military personnel. In the Rural Areas, 3,100 of the 22,896 jobs in 2020 are held by military personnel.

Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

2024 Work Plan, Scope of Work, and Budget Proposal

Draft v. 8/8/23





II. KRCC Land Use Program 2024 Work Plan Narrative

The proposed land use program work plan items for 2023 are outlined in the table below. KRCC staff will support the KRCC Board, Land Use Planning Policy Committee (PlanPOL), and Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC) in completing these action items.

Legend: These work plans include the following activities represented by icons:



Research/Writing



Discussions at Meetings



Letters



Requires KRCC Board Approval

| | Action Item | | LUTAC's Role | | PlanPOL's Role | | Board's Role | | | | | |
|----|---|-----|--|----------|--|----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | KRCC | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. | Support each jurisdiction's periodic update to Comprehensive Plan, including incorporating housing allocations. | | Share resources, receive presentations from Commerce and others, hold a workshop focused on incorporating housing allocations. | *** | Share resources, receive presentations from Commerce and others, hold a workshop focused on incorporating housing allocations. | | Share resources, receive presentations from Commerce and others. | | | | | |
| 2. | Maintain list of Centers of Growth in the Countywide Planning Policies, as defined by PSRC and KRCC. | *** | Review applications for Centers of Growth designation. | | Review applications for Centers of Growth designation. | 2 | Update the Countywide Planning Policies with new Centers of Growth. | | | | | |
| | | | Puget Sound Regiona | l Counc | il (PSRC) Involvement | | | | | | | |
| 3. | Advise on any relevant PSRC planning efforts. | | Provide feedback to PSRC as appropriate. | | Provide feedback to PSRC as appropriate. | 202 | Provide feedback to PSRC as appropriate. | | | | | |
| | | | KRCC (| Operatio | ons | | | | | | | |
| 4. | Ensure messaging consistency between policy and technical committees. | | KRCC staff will serve as the liaison. | | PlanPOL meetings have LUTAC updates as standing agenda items. | | Board meetings have PlanPOL and LUTAC updates as standing items. | | | | | |
| | | | Oth | er | | | | | | | | |
| 5. | Coordinate on annexations and develop the annual annexation report. | | LUTAC develops a draft annual annexation report. | | PlanPOL reviews the draft annual annexation report. | <u>*</u> | KRCC Board approves the annual annexation report. | | | | | |

Triangle Associates Scope of Work: Land Use Program

II.A. Land Use Planning Policy Committee (PlanPOL) Facilitation and Coordination

To support the KRCC PlanPOL, Triangle will provide a <u>Land Use Program Lead</u> who will report to the Program Director. An additional administrative staff will help support the technology associated with hybrid PlanPOL meetings.

The Land Use Lead will be responsible for drafting PlanPOL meeting agendas in coordination with PlanPOL and the Executive Committee, gathering and compiling meeting materials, and sending packets to PlanPOL at least 5 days before meetings. Triangle will also be responsible for providing staff for posting meeting information on the KRCC website, notetaking, drafting meeting summaries, as well as tracking and implementing action items prior to and following each meeting.

| Staff Meetings | | Sub-Task Deliverables | Assumptions | | |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Sophie GlassPauline Mogilevsky | 3 PlanPOL meetings | Meeting agendas (draft and final) Meeting summaries (draft and final) Meeting materials as needed, including maintaining communications with PSRC Report outs to the KRCC Board in person | Meetings will be 1.5-hours in duration Meetings will be held virtually with an option for members of the public to attend in person | | |

II.B. Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC) Facilitation and Coordination

To support the KRCC Board's Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC), Triangle will provide a KRCC Land Use Program Lead who will report to the Program Director, provide staff support to LUTAC, and facilitate LUTAC meetings. The Land Use Program Lead will be responsible for drafting LUTAC agendas in coordination with the Program Director and LUTAC members, gathering and constructing meeting materials, and sending materials to LUTAC at least 5 days before LUTAC meetings. The Program Lead is also responsible for notetaking, drafting and finalizing meeting memos of action items and key discussion areas, as well as tracking and implementing action items following each meeting.

| Staff | Meetings | Sub-Task Deliverables | Assumptions |
|----------------------------------|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|
| Sophie Glass | • 4 LUTAC | Meeting agendas (draft and final) | Meetings will be 2-hours in duration |
| Pauline | meetings | Meeting memo of action items and key discussion | and will be held virtually |
| Mogilevsky | | items | |
| | | Recommendations to PlanPOL developed by LUTAC | |

V. 2024 Calendar of Expected Meetings

| | | January | February | March | April | May | June | July | August | September | October | November | December |
|----------------|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|--------|--|------------------------------------|---|---|
| tive | Board* 1st Tues. Time varies | | Feb 6 Board Meeting TBD | | | May 7 Board Meeting TBD | Jun 4 Board Meeting TBD | | | | Oct 1 Board Meeting TBD | Nov 5 Board Meeting TBD | Dec 3 Board Meeting TBD |
| Executive | Executive Committee 3rd Thurs. 11:00AM- 1:00PM | Jan 18 Executive Committee Meeting | Feb 15 Executive Committee Meeting | Mar 14 Executive Committee Meeting | Apr 18 Executive Committee Meeting | May 16 Executive Committee Meeting | Jun 20 Executive Committee Meeting | Jul 18 Executive Committee Meeting (cancel if not needed) | | Sept 19 Executive Committee Meeting | Oct 17 Executive Committee Meeting | Nov 21 Executive Committee Meeting | Dec 19 Executive Committee Meeting |
| Use | | | | Mar 19 PlanPOL Meeting | | | Jun 18 PlanPOL Meeting | | | | Oct 15 PlanPOL Meeting | | |
| Land | LUTAC 2 nd Thurs. 9:30-11:30AM | Jan 11 LUTAC Meeting | | | Apr 11 LUTAC Meeting | | | | | Sept 12 LUTAC Meeting | | Nov 14 LUTAC Meeting | |
| ion | TransPOL* 3rd Thurs. 3:00-4:30PM | Jan 18 TransPOL Meeting | | Mar 21 TransPOL Meeting | Apr 18 TransPOL Meeting | May 16 TransPOL Meeting | | | | | Oct 17 TransPOL Meeting | | |
| Transportation | TransTAC 2 nd Thurs. 1:30-3:00PM | Jan 11 TransTAC Meeting | Feb 8 TransTAC Meeting | Mar 14 TransTAC Meeting | Apr 11 TransTAC Meeting | May 9 TransTAC Meeting Late May Project Selection Workshop | | | | Sept 12 TransTAC Meeting | | | Dec 14 TransTAC Meeting |

KRCC Retreat Date: TBD

Legislative Reception Date: TBD date



Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council

Tentative 2023 Meeting Plan for

Land Use Technical Advisory Committee (LUTAC) and Land Use Policy Committee (PlanPOL)

DRAFT v. 8/11/23

| January 12 LUTAC Meeting | February 7 KRCC Board/LUTAC Housing Target Meeting | February 9 LUTAC Meeting | February 23 LUTAC Meeting | March 9 LUTAC Meeting | March 21 PlanPOL Meeting | March 23 LUTAC Meeting | April 13 LUTAC Meeting | April 18 PlanPOL Meeting |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Agenda Items: Review slide deck and talking points for February 7 meeting Population and employment targets – baseline numbers KRCC staff present updated numbers for UGAs KRCC staff share out on social services inventory | Agenda Items: Commerce presentation (foundations of housing targets) Policy implications to be aware of Methodologies A, B, C - pros and cons HAPs vs. housing targets Question: inputs to consider for local Kitsap method? | Agenda Items: Population and employment targets — baseline numbers KRCC staff present on other counties' housing target approaches KRCC staff present comparison of Housing Needs Assessment numbers | Agenda Items: Population and employment targets — baseline numbers Discuss methodology C approach Confirm March 21 PlanPOL meeting topics | Agenda Items: Population and employment targets — baseline numbers Commerce guidance on implementation (invite Commerce) Confirm methodology to share with PlanPOL | Agenda Items: • Affordable housing round-robin • Explain methodology • Show methodology allocations | Agenda Items: • Discuss April PlanPOL agenda • Continue refining housing allocations | Canceled | Agenda Items: Review draft housing allocations Affordable housing round-robin Confirm materials for May 2 KRCC Board meeting |
| April 27 LUTAC Meeting | May 2 KRCC Board Meeting | May 11 LUTAC Meeting | May 25 LUTAC Meeting | June 6 KRCC Board Meeting | June 20 PlanPOL Meeting | September 14 LUTAC Meeting | October 17 PlanPOL Meeting | November 9 LUTAC Meeting |
| Agenda Items: • Final preparation for May 2 KRCC Board meeting | Agenda Items: • Review draft housing allocations | Canceled | Canceled | Agenda Items: Vote on whether to adopt housing allocations as an appendix to the Countywide Planning Policies | Agenda Items: • Affordable housing round-robin | Agenda Items: Revisit 2022 adjustments to population and employment targets 2024 KRCC Land Use Program development (see PSRC's CPP certification report for suggestions on Kitsap's CPPs) Check in about updating baseline number consistently across jurisdictions WE ARE HERE | Agenda Items: • Affordable housing round-robin | Agenda Items: • Annual annexation report • PSRC RSC appointment • See if there are updates from Commerce on 2023 legislation guidance |