



Hood Canal Coordinating Council

Jefferson, Kitsap & Mason Counties; Port Gamble S'Klallam & Skokomish Tribes

Landscape Assessment and Prioritization (LAP) Tool Advisory Group Meeting #3

Date: November 14, 2019; 10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Location: HCCC office, 17791 Fjord Drive, NE, Suite 124, Poulsbo, WA

Participants:

1. Kell Rowan- Mason County Planning
2. Kathy Peters, Kitsap County Department of Community Development
3. Dave Herrera, HCCC Board, Policy Advisor Skokomish Tribe
4. Scott Brewer, HCCC Executive Director
5. Nate White, HCCC Watershed Project Coordinator
6. Haley Harguth, HCCC Watershed Program Manager
7. Heidi Huber, HCCC Programs Development Coordinator

[Link to PPT Presentation Slides](#)

LAP Tool Timeline

- HCCC's consultant has 7.5 hours to complete any edits for phase 1
- HCCC Board Review December 11, 2019
- Draft report due Feb 1, 2020
- Final report due March 31, 2020
- Lap Tool roadshow to planning dept staff and partners: ongoing
- Applying recommendations: ongoing
- Phase 2: TBD, dependent on funding opportunities

Commented [NW1]: 8 hours was cited in the meeting: our consultant has since clarified we have 7.5 hours.

LAP Tool Advisory Group Meeting #2 review

- Discussed changes suggested during Meeting #2 and their status
 - Land management:
 - o Completed Phase 1
 - More explanation of Land Management categories in metadata
 - o Consider for Phase 2
 - Verify tax assessor ownership land use data
 - Explore new land management categories
 - Current/Future development levels
 - o Completed Phase 1
 - Categorized public and private timber properties as "less developed"
 - o Consider for Phase 2
 - Use subdivision, LLC ownership to predict likely future development
 - Use a development scale instead of less, semi-, more descriptors
 - Add layers for context
 - o Completed Phase 1
 - Added critical areas, and restoration to "Ecological Land Management"

- Used comprehensive plans, population growth to predict future development
- Pilot areas
 - o Completed Phase 1
 - One pilot area in each county
- Pilot Area Analysis
 - Nate reviewed ppt presentation with the tasks, steps, results and analysis process.
 - The group discussed the idea that to “Avoid” habitat degradation is priority over minimization and mitigation.

AVOID > MINIMIZE > MITIGATE

- Comments:
- True avoidance is difficult due to private property rights. Ex: docks on water bodies. If the county can't outright prohibit docks (avoid) then our options are to either minimize or mitigate.
- Difficult to know long term how successful on site mitigation is over time.
- Land use laws would have to change to truly get to “Avoid”. There are ways to integrate avoidance activities within a proposed project by altering project design to avoid certain sensitive areas. Skokomish Tribe has been extremely successful in limiting new docks in Hood Canal.
- There would have to be a change to WA states vesting laws (which are some of the strongest in the country).
- Would also have to address concerns about taking parcels off the tax rolls when purchasing properties for conservation.
- What you do with these flagged parcels is critical (flagged parcels refers to those identified by LAP Tool as high priority for conservation). Do you publicly identify them so property owners know you are interested in their property?
- How do we give planners a tool that supports them in saying No to a property owner's proposed project? In the permit planning world we are constrained, we are not able to outright prohibit things.
- Need to talk about this as an economic issue. Need to fund protection of parcels that are important to the region. Consider a conservation easement program.
- Pilot areas seem to be missing some important streams for West Kitsap. Staff response: we understand there are gaps and that we haven't captured all important summer chum watersheds, our goal is to expand if we have more funding/resources for phase 2.
- In your analysis showing areas with highest concentration of projected change (darker purple= >change), why is toandos peninsula showing so much activity? Staff response: This has to do with many currently less developed parcels being zoned for more developed uses. The reality may be that this area for various reasons isn't a concern for increased development even though it is highlighted in the analysis as an area of concern. There will have to be some ground-truthing and discussion with partners to truly identify those high priority areas that we believe are most at risk. Will need more resources to do this thoroughly and across Hood Canal.
- HCCC staff asked for clarification on zone codes for Kitsap County (rural residential, rural protected, rural wooded); no objections were raised to the Future Development Levels assigned to the different zone codes of the Kitsap Highest Priority Parcels.

LAP Tool demo – HCCC staff pulled up the LAP Tool for a live demonstration.
Comments:

- “How to Use” section – there was some confusion about whether highlighted blue areas were supposed to be hyperlinks. Suggestion to make this more clear by either including links, or changing text color (maybe just black bold?).
- “How to Use” section – someone experienced issues when accessing with google chrome. The text displayed so small it was not readable.
- Can the tool be shared with our co-workers? Staff response: Yes! HCCC also plans to do an outreach roadshow to share tool and gain feedback.
- Layer review
 - o HCCC staff walked through the various layers in the tool
- Functionality walkthrough
 - o HCCC staff walked through the various functions of the tool

Comments:

- Thank you for providing a link to the metadata! This is very helpful.
- You may be missing some levels of protection. Ex: In the Skokomish valley a portion of the river has been designated a floodway by FEMA and Mason County. The County has a larger portion designated as a floodway than FEMA. Landowners cannot rebuild in the floodway once the buildings degrade. For more information see *floodway data layer, flood damage prevention ordinance*.
- HCCC Staff: For Big Beef Creek, curious what is the riparian buffer requirement? I’m assuming there is a buffer requirement
 - Yes there is a 150 foot buffer, but a landowner can apply for conditional use permits and variances. If the lot size is small as most shoreline and riverfront properties are, one can get a variance.
- Might be helpful to have a protected lands layer to overlay, to see what has already been conserved in the area.
 - Conservation easements aren’t picked up in tax assessor data.
 - HCCC Staff: how can we maintain a protected lands database? We would need to work with local land trusts to get data annually. Would be great if we could continue holding meetings for the conservation acquisition partners group as we have in the past. This takes time and resources and attendance has been spotty in the past. Worth looking into. Would be a good forum to share the LAP Tool with conservation partners.
 - HCCC Staff: Conservation easements data included in the tool is from a national database. Counties don’t track conservation easements. Nick with the WA Association of Land Trusts would be a good resource. HCCC has had preliminary contact with him.
 - Population growth layer (growth over recent years) – why does this show dense population growth in forest service area? Staff response: This particular analysis uses census block group data. In this case it’s a little misleading, since the bulk of that growth was likely along the shoreline but it displays further out into forest service land. That’s a little misleading.
 - HCCC staff attempted to incorporate a really informative Future Population Growth layer through ESRI but ran into technical difficulties incorporating data, plus you have to pay per view. Would be worth looking into further.
 - Look into the Kitsap buildable lands analysis. Might be a good resource for phase 2 work. Problem is all counties aren’t required to do this. Mason doesn’t have to. WRIA 14 is doing population growth projections. Is Jefferson County developing any population analysis tool? Would be

good to check with Patty Charnas on this. Do counties have some type of land capacity analysis?

Where do we go from here?

- Improvements/troubleshooting?
- Questions to consider

Comments/Questions:

- o HCCC staff to meeting participants: Do you consider any of this information sensitive? Response: All of this information is already public on our GIS layers.
- o Are the highest priority parcels we selected useful?
 - On the regulator side (Mason) the tool can be useful for HCCC or tribe (for example) for project planning purposes. Or for planning department to use for discussions with commissioners on water quality or grant opportunities. It is less a tool for the planning department to make decisions. It is not a regulatory tool.
 - We have to be careful about making assumptions about parcels being low priority (already somewhat protected) based solely on landowner, when it may not truly be protected. For example in Kitsap a priority parcel for environmental conservation was just sold out from the county to a private landowner. There are probably some parcels along lower Hood Canal/Kitsap that are being missed.
 - Would be interesting to have a way to incorporate real estate data/trends. HCCC's ILF program has had difficulty finding mitigation properties for ILF program due to demand for shoreline parcels.
 - How can we work better together as local governments to take control of preserving key properties? We need to ensure that we all have the same objective of working together to protect habitat. Are other parts of Puget Sound doing something similar?
 - The West Sound salmon recovery LE (East Kitsap) is working on this.
 - Keep in mind when you are bringing this to the counties that it may not be appealing if it is only covering part of their area. For example the tool only covers a portion of Kitsap. It would be nice to present to planning department in a way that shows how they can apply the tool to the entire county not just half of it. Having 4 cities within Kitsap causes complications when discussing land use.
 - Important to have Critical Areas Ordinances include Federally-designated critical habitat. It isn't currently required. Will be included in the steelhead recovery plan.
 - HCCC Staff: It will be good to meet with our Board and have this discussion. If this tool can clearly designate areas that are the highest priority habitats and face biggest risks, and HCCC can say these are the sites, that message will trickle down to planning departments and regulators.
 - Is there support for using salmon funds to conserve high priority properties. Yes! In some areas conservation/acquisition projects are ranked highest. But review panel(?)/funders want sponsors/LE to prove that acquisition projects aren't already protected by existing regulations
- o Important to determine where we want future development, need to have density focused in clustered areas.

- Need to address issue/argument of conservation = removing parcels from tax base.
- Shelton, Allyn, Belfair; these are the 3 urban growth areas for Mason. That's where denser development can happen. Zoned Rural Residential 5 (RR5) everywhere else. That is very sprawling. Also note that previously subdivided lots primarily around water bodies have lots of small non-conforming lot sizes. Would be great to look closer at RR5 zoned properties. For example between Allyn and Belfair it is zoned mostly RR5 with large parcels, could look into proposing some of these be zoned to RR20. Currently forest land owners now. Unfortunately this exercise would mainly affect inland parcels, as the majority of shoreline parcels are very small lot sizes.
- Lack of capacity is a huge issue for counties.
- Ideally the tool could be used by HCCC Board/staff to engage county planning staff and discuss possible zone changes, etc. Could also be used by tribal councils.
- LAP Tool applications:
- Comments/Questions:
 - Tool could empower HCCC to identify areas that need policy level discussion, work with Board and working group to propose changes. Bring to counties to update processes for critical planning documents.
 - Important to explore the Kitsap Natural Asset Management Tool which monetizes environmental services. Contact Dave Ward. The Kitsap NAMT could provide useful input information for the LAP tool. It is funded through WA Environmental Council grant. It is important to be able to communicate to the public about the benefit of environmental resources.
 - Important to present the tool with your vision and tie it into long term goal. Summer chum recovery, as one example. Maybe this can be better communicated in the text on the LAP Tool main page.
- Restoration/project planning applications
- HCCC presented potential recommendations for LAP Tool Applications (excerpt from ppt slide):

Potential recommendations for how to use LAP Tool:

- *Acquisitions*
- *Restoration*
- *Best Management Practices*
- *Transfer of Regional Development Rights*
- *Land use discussions (zoning, CAO, SMP, etc.)*
- *Outreach/Education*
- *Hirst decision planning*

Comments:

- The group agrees with all of the recommended applications listed above.
- Transfer of Development Rights (TDR): this is something Mason County doesn't do, but we are talking about it. GMA's have to be revised? Kitsap has a TDR available but nowhere to receive.
- Could use LAP Tool to add to discussion about *regional* transfer of development rights. How does this happen? Cooperation amongst jurisdictions. Who facilitates that discussion? HCCC. Puget Sound Regional Council. Could work together.

- Consider PSP land use subcommittee. Commerce needs to help local jurisdictions on such issues as Transfer of Development Rights. The Ruckelshaus report was disappointing.
- We can't delist summer chum until we can say we have some handle on growth in Hood Canal.
- Explore LAP Tool's use for Transfer of Development Rights discussion
- May get push back on best management practices, there are lots of agencies that have tools. Where do best management practices need to be applied?
- Could tool be useful in projects related to the Hirst decision??
- Need to determine who the audience is. This is a question for the HCCC Board
- HCCC should consider outreach to the Peninsula Planners Forum which holds qly planning meetings for cities and counties (Gary Idleburg is the Commerce contact). Next meeting is in January. Also consider WASAC, five different sections of WA APA.

Next steps/adjourn

(from PPT Slide)

- Talk with your Commissioners and staff about LAP Tool in preparation for HCCC Board presentation, roadshow
- Make final edits (7.5 hours of edit time)
- Present to HCCC Board Dec. 11, 2019, 1:00-4:00 PM
 - Advisory Group encouraged to attend to show your support!
- Roadshow: HCCC wants to present LAP Tool to your planning staffs to get additional feedback, ideas for future use
- Salish Sea Ecosystem Conference in Vancouver B.C., April 2020
 - Session: "Best Land Use Practices for Conservation in a World of Growing Populations and Increasing Sprawl"

Commented [NW2]: 8 hours was cited in the meeting: our consultant has since clarified we have 7.5 hours.