

Minter Creek Watershed Strategies
DRAFT Meeting Summary
December 11, 2013

Attendees on December 11: Rollo Van Slyke, Roger Gay, Ryan Sandstrom, Nancy Hansen, Danna Webster, Judy Austin, Brent Shown, Scott Gallacher, Rick Sorrels, Ann Schnitzer, Kent Kingman, Erin Ewald, Barbara Ann Smolko (Pierce County), Dave Greetham and Katrina Knutson (Kitsap County).

Facilitators: Heather Ballash and Anne Fritzel, Washington State Department of Commerce.

Informational updates

The following informational updates were provided to the group:

- Community centers are allowed as a conditional use in rural centers in both counties.
- Heather Ballash searched Department of Ecology’s water quality violation web site and could not find any recent violations in Minter Creek.
- Barbara Ann Smolko shared Pierce County maps of the pollution potential index and locations of connection wells with well-head protection areas. Kitsap County has similar maps [Kitsap is working on a link to the maps].
- Scott Gallacher, Key Pen Parks, stated that there has been some coordination with Pierce County Public Works transportation regarding trails, but not in the West end of the peninsula.
- Dave Greetham indicated the stream map update (“water typing”) for Minter watershed appears likely to move forward. This effort may be expanded to include other watersheds on the Key Peninsula.

Review of potential conflicts/issues

The group reviewed the list of potential conflicts/issues and strategies. They added some strategies and added one conflict/issue with strategies. They then grouped the conflicts that relate to each other. Finally, they did a dot voting exercise to prioritize conflicts – people had six dots to vote on whether a conflict was a high priority (no more than two per conflict per person) and one dot to vote on whether a conflict is not a priority that should be included in the report to the counties. That work is reflected in the table below. (Note #2 and #3 were reversed from the November 21 notes)

Potential conflicts	Strategies for addressing the conflicts	Level of Priority/Number of votes received
Group A		
1. Resistance to any change by affected property owners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buy the land or an easement • Educate and communicate with property owners, community, elected officials, conservation groups • Scale back the plan and take small steps 	5 votes high priority
6. Cannot change grandfathered uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site-specific Comp Plan/rezone requests can be made in Kitsap, during limited time windows • Comp plan amendment – 2015 comp plan update in Pierce County and 2016 in Kitsap County 	3 votes high priority

<p>10. Could be impacted by potential for cottage industry on every residential parcel in Pierce County, and grandfathered existing and home-based uses in Kitsap County. [Note to the group: this has been revised to provide clarity. If this doesn't clarify the issue correctly, please provide clarification.]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buy the land or an easement • Educate and communicate with property owners, community, elected officials, conservation groups • Scale back the plan and take small steps • Preserving/creating greenbelts and wildlife corridors (fly over and look at it) • Include food sales in new commercial areas • Minimize driving through local services/retail • Mitigation for impacts • Manage traffic through the existing use regulations 	<p>4 votes high priority</p>
<p>Group B</p>		
<p>8. Conflict of traffic from small business, agri-tourism, local food production and sales on site vs. a local distribution center</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manage traffic through the existing use regulations • Provide infrastructure to support agriculture 	<p>2 votes high priority 1 vote not a priority</p>
<p>9. Match agricultural taxation and zoning within Pierce County [Note: this would be a problem in Kitsap County]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Match open space taxation to zoning • Pierce County needs to be clear on the process (now based on application – soils/yield) • Encourage agricultural clustering 	<p>4 votes high priority</p>
<p>Group C</p>		
<p>5. Former Brookside Restaurant (rural activity center) – conflict between existing use and critical areas ordinance – what will happen if it is purchased and the new owner cannot use it as they would like? Note: is in designated open space corridor</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Require low impact development (Pierce County – filter strips, rain gardens, and pervious pavement • Restrict uses to those with fewer people using water (septic), especially next to the stream – i.e. office, non-food retail • Move the commercially-zoned area away from the stream with new traffic access (politically difficult) • Help businesses improve water and septic system problems • Let nature/business close as water and septic systems fail. 	<p>3 votes high priority 2 votes not a priority</p>

<p>2 (formerly #3). Resistance to expansion of commercial areas by conservation groups or neighborhood groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preserving/creating greenbelts and wildlife corridors (fly over and look at it) • Include food sales in new commercial areas • Minimize driving through local services/retail • Mitigation for impacts to green belts and wildlife habitat 	<p>7 votes high priority</p>
<p>7. Airport area: Additional commercial development may prove difficult if requesting 'big box' and large urban type uses, since this is not currently permitted by zoning</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buy the land or an easement • Educate and communicate with property owners, community, elected officials, conservation groups • Scale back intensity of the plan and take small steps • Airport as incubator for businesses (light industrial zone allows this) • Restrict hazardous uses – this is regulated through County Health and Storm Water • Technology for septic • Airport area plan for the airport; employment center/ commercial uses to serve neighborhood residents; maintain and keep future commercial development to low intensity/rural commercial uses (no 'big box') • Subarea plan around airport property (airport area plus some property around it) 	<p>11 votes high priority</p>
<p>Group D</p>		
<p>12. Future land use conflicts with wildlife</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate and encourage landowners to protect and enhance corridors • Do additional studies about needs for wildlife – connectivity, water quality • Combine with trails • Determine if stream buffers are sufficient • Use Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat and Species information • Update stream typing maps (in process) • Adopt a viable rural wooded 	<p>9 votes high priority</p>

	incentive plan in Kitsap County	
--	---------------------------------	--

Group E		
4. Wicks Lake – conflict between conserving open space and more intense residential development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential and trails together reduces traffic impacts • Adequate buffers for new development • Consistent zoning with surrounding parcels 	4 votes high priority
11. Road expansion connecting Lake Helena to Lakeway could conflict with desire for parks and trails in the area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make some trade offs (mitigation) • Check whether there already is a right-of-way (in VISION 2040) • Work with the owner (Alpine Evergreen) • Do the road expansion and create parks and trails through a master plan 	2 votes high priority
Group F		
13. Ability of counties to work together on land use issues that cross jurisdictional boundaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication protocol • Coordination of water quality testing: Kitsap DOH and Stream Team (Surface Water Management?); Pierce Surface Management; State Department of Health • Participate in regional planning • Educate 	11 votes high priority
3 (formerly #2). Resistance to change by county commissioners and council - inertia of “status quo” and fact that a plan was adopted after a six-year process in Pierce County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grass roots efforts to communicate own values and vision – local investment in a process • Elect new officials • Share results to inform comprehensive plan update (this process) • More communication/input to the comprehensive plan (Come back to the Minter Creek Watershed Strategies group with comprehensive plan updates) • Change = Minter Creek process recommendations 	1 vote high priority Concerns expressed about including this in the report as a conflict

Next steps: Draft report to the counties for group to review at the next meeting.

Next meeting – January 29, 2:00 – 4:00 p.m., Key Center Fire Station