

# INTRODUCTION

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vision Statement.....	
Goals.....	
Five Overriding Principles.....	
Introduction to the 2004 Update of the Comprehensive Plan.....	1
Introduction to the 1994 Comprehensive Plan.....	9



# VISION STATEMENT

Bainbridge Island is a cohesive community with a distinctive urban center and individual settlements. Winslow is the heart of the Island. It is the place where all residents come to transact daily commerce and to meet for social activities. Its vibrant, pedestrian-oriented core should be enhanced as a center for the Island's commercial activity, a common area or center where the local community can meet. The neighborhood service centers of Rolling Bay, Island Center, and Lynnwood Center offer small-scale commercial and service activity outside Winslow. These areas would remain much as they are, with some in-fill development.

Outside of Winslow and the service centers, Bainbridge Island should preserve its pastoral heritage, which is rooted in its open spaces, winding roads, and small-scale agricultural establishments. It should preserve the distinctive qualities of its harbors and small communities. New development should be compatible with the natural landscape.

Bainbridge Island is economically linked to Seattle; however, the artistic, cultural and entrepreneurial spirit of its residents should be encouraged by providing opportunities for environmentally-sound businesses and home occupations.

The Island's natural amenities should be linked through corridors of green--trails, wildlife corridors, and landscape buffers along scenic roads and major arterials. Public access to the shoreline should be improved and the shoreline should be protected from overdevelopment. Development should not be haphazardly imposed upon the landscape, but should be sensitive to its natural environs, recognizing the natural carrying capacity of Bainbridge as an Island, based on the principle that the Island's environmental resources are finite and must be maintained at a sustainable level. Foremost, Bainbridge Island should preserve the diversity of one of its most precious resources--its people. The Island should remain a place where the business people, artists, farmers and long-time residents can all find a place to live.

# GOALS

- Preserve open space and the character of the natural landscape.
- Preserve environmentally sensitive areas.
- Protect the water resources of the Island, which are of primary importance to its residents.
- Preserve and encourage agricultural activities as a means of providing locally grown food, enhancing the cultural and economic diversity of the community and preserving open space and view corridors.
- Foster the diversity of the residents of the Island, its most precious resource.
- Encourage the retention of small-scale service centers outside Winslow.
- Provide a variety of housing choices for residents.
- Foster a financially sound development pattern.
- Preserve a reasonable use of the land for all landowners.
- Reduce reliance on the auto and encourage establishment of pedestrian and bicycle-oriented communities.
- Provide affordable housing.
- Establish Winslow's urban core as a mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented village.
- Foster the energy, drive, initiative and artistic talent of Island residents by encouraging home occupations and environmentally-sound businesses, with minimal impact on groundwater resources.
- Provide adequate public facilities and utilities within the citizens' ability to pay which maximize public safety and minimize adverse environmental impacts.
- Support, protect and enhance the value of the arts and humanities as essential to education, quality of life, economic vitality, broadening of mind and spirit, and as treasure in trust for our descendants.

## **FIVE OVERRIDING PRINCIPLES THAT GUIDE THE PLAN**

1. Preserve the special character of the Island which includes forested areas, meadows, farms, marine views, and winding roads bordered by dense vegetation.
2. Protect the water resources of the Island.
3. Foster diversity of the residents of the Island, its most precious resource.
4. The costs and benefits to property owners should be considered in making land use decisions.
5. Development should be based on the principle that the Island's environmental resources are finite and must be maintained at a sustainable level.



# INTRODUCTION

## INTRODUCTION TO THE 2004 UPDATE OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

The City is required by the Growth Management Act (GMA, RCW 36.70A) to review, and if needed, revise the Comprehensive Plan to address changes in local and regional conditions and state or federal laws since the original plan was adopted in 1994. The City of Bainbridge Island GMA Comprehensive Plan review must be completed by December 2004.

### **Development of the Plan Update Process**

The City began the review process in 2000 with the appointment of a steering committee made up of three City Council members, three Planning Commissioners and staff. The committee decided on a methodology for the review, dividing the process into three phases:

#### *Phase One – Information Gathering – 2000*

In Phase One, staff analyzed the existing policies of the Plan and prepared the document “Staff Review 2000,” which provided a review of actions taken to date to implement the Plan. The staff review also included recommendations for revising some of the goals and policies.

Another important component of Phase One was the completion of a new community values survey, to measure any change in community sentiment since the 1992 Community Values Survey was conducted as part of the development of the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. The new survey, with slight modifications, was conducted in May 2000 and a final report was published in July 2000 (*Bainbridge Island Community Values Survey Report*, July 10, 2000, Pacific Rim Resources, Inc.). The results of the survey were presented to the public and the City Council at an open house on July 26, 2000.

#### *Phase Two – Analysis – November 2000 - January 2001*

The steering committee reviewed the results of the community survey and staff review and determined that the goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan still represented the community’s vision, and that substantive revisions were not necessary. The Planning Commission was directed to begin their review of the Plan, discussing each element individually and proceeding policy by policy. The steering committee also decided that consideration of public comment provided in writing and at Planning Commission meetings should be an important part of the review process. At the end of the discussion of each element, agreed-upon changes were to be publicized for public comment at a public hearing before the Planning Commission.

## *Phase Three – Recommended Action – January 2001 – March 2004*

### **Planning Commission Review**

The Commission began their review in early 2001, using the *2000 Staff Review* and the results of the *2000 Community Values Survey* as the basis for their discussions. Through a series of study sessions and public hearings, the Commission completed the review process in January 2004, held a final series of public hearings and a workshop, gathered additional community input and forwarded their recommendation along with the public comments to the City Council in March 2004.

### **City Council Committee Review – March 2004 - December 2004**

The City Council continued the public review process through the spring and summer of 2004, reviewing each of the Planning Commission recommendations on the elements of the Plan within the four Council Committees (Public Works and Transportation Committee, Land Use Committee, Finance Committee, and Community Relations Committee), and holding a series of public meetings. The Council held a public open house and workshop on the entire Plan Update in September 2004 and then a series of public hearings, gathering additional public input prior to adopting the revisions.

### **County-wide Planning Policies (CWPP)**

In coordination with the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council, in which the City of Bainbridge Island participates, Kitsap County adopted the County-wide Planning Policies in 2001 and amended in 2003. The City reviewed the policies in relationship to the Comprehensive Plan and ratified the County-wide Policies in 2001, and again with the revisions in 2003. The Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council is currently updating these policies.

### **Socioeconomic Profile**

Since the development of the 1994 Plan, the socioeconomic character of Bainbridge Island has changed only slightly. The population has grown to 20,760 (Office of Financial Management estimate for 2004), in line with the expected growth trend of the 2012 population projection. From 1990 to 2000, the population grew from 15,846 to 20,308, an increase of 4,462 people, or a 28% increase in population.

The 2000 census reports that 92.9 % of Islanders are listed as white and that those of Asian ancestry (Japanese, Filipino and Vietnamese) remain the largest minority on the Island.

The Island experienced an increase in employment of 52% between 1990 to 2000, from 3,460 jobs to 5,271 jobs. The majority of the job growth was in the finance, real estate and service sectors, with an increase of 69%. Manufacturing employment increased 60% after decreasing last decade; however, it represents only 11% of the jobs on the Island.

### **Community Values**

As required by the GMA, the City of Bainbridge Island produced its first Comprehensive Plan in 1994, to outline strategies to manage growth on the Island through the year 2012. A community values survey was conducted for the 1994 Plan.

In 2000, the City began the required update of the Comprehensive Plan by again identifying the community values and opinions about land use, growth, environment, and related policy issues. The City of Bainbridge Island contracted with Pacific Rim Resources (PRR) to develop and implement a random community values survey and analyze the resulting data. The 2000 survey was based largely on the 1992 survey to allow for direct comparisons. The survey was administered by telephone to 406 residential households.

A random telephone survey format was chosen because it would yield an unbiased, objective and scientific analysis of public opinions about growth issues on Bainbridge Island.

Specifically, the objectives of the survey were to:

- Determine significant changes in public attitudes since the 1992 Community Values Survey;
- Understand residents' vision for the future of Bainbridge Island;
- Understand residents' perceptions about Bainbridge Island's character;
- Prioritize residents' desires for services and improvements;
- Determine levels of support for a variety of growth management issues;
- Assess attitudes about restricting private property rights;
- Determine whether residents support the development of affordable housing;
- Determine the willingness of residents to support tax increases to pay for additional services or improvements;
- Identify the most effective means of communicating with residents about the Comprehensive Plan.

### *Conclusions and General Recommendations from the Survey Consultant*

- In general, residents appear to have mixed feelings about past growth on the Island, and little enthusiasm for future development. There is still little support for additional shopping facilities, office space, or industrial facilities, and job creation is not a high priority.
- While traffic congestion is one of the issues of most concern to residents, there is clear support for maintaining narrow, winding roads with native vegetation and other public services. Clarifying the tradeoff between expanding roads and maintaining narrow, winding character could reduce the potential for unreasonable expectations with respect to congestion improvements. More creative solutions than road widening and straightening should be considered to address traffic problems.
- Increasing park-and-ride lots, expanding the sewer and water systems, and expanding roadways are the issues with the least support in the community. If it is determined that these are needed services, public education activities will be needed to broaden understanding of these issues.
- Residents are surprisingly willing to be taxed, both for environmental preservation and for "quality of life" improvements like pedestrian and bike trails and new parks and recreational areas. These are the items around which a base of support would most easily

be built in terms of tax proposals.

- Although Bainbridge Island residents recognized the importance of a mix of incomes and affordable housing and favored the issue when asked to rate it, few were willing to be taxed in support of affordable housing.
- Bainbridge Island residents opposed improved police and fire services, road expansion, development of manufacturing, additional shopping facilities and other infrastructure improvements that support growth.
- Newspaper articles should be the primary mechanism for reaching Bainbridge Island residents, followed by mail. The city website has gained in popularity.

## **Planning Under GMA**

Under the Growth Management Act, updates to the Comprehensive Plan may occur on an on-going basis to reflect local needs, new data or new law, but they must occur in a deliberate manner every seven years [RCW 3670A.130(4)]. This deliberate GMA Update process includes four basic steps: 1) establish a public participation program that identifies procedures and schedules for the review, evaluation and possible revision process; 2) review of relevant regulations; 3) analysis of need for revisions; and 4) adoption of an appropriate resolution and/or amendments.

The issues that the Washington State Office of Community Development (OCD) advises communities to address in their GMA Update include: urban densities; urban growth areas; critical areas; natural resource lands; essential public facilities; affordable housing for all income levels; transportation, including levels of service to meet future needs; and shorelines.

***Population assumptions:*** According to GMA the Comprehensive Plan must be evaluated based on the most recent 20-year population forecast, expressed in a range from high to low, on a county-by-county basis. RCW 36.70A.130(1)(b) specifically states that the review must include an analysis of the population allocated to a city from the most recent ten-year population forecast by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). According to guidance from OCD, the City has three options in dealing with population forecasts in the GMA Update processes: 1) Continue with existing county-wide population projections; 2) Use the new OFM county-wide population forecasts; or 3) Work with the County to develop own population projections and reallocate population based on these projections.

Although OFM has provided a 20-year forecast for Kitsap County (January 2002), the official allocation for the City of Bainbridge Island for the year 2025 has not yet been finalized; therefore the 2004 Update utilizes option one, continuing with the 2012 population projection for the City. The City will re-evaluate the Comprehensive Plan again in 2005 upon receiving the official 2025 population allocations from the County, expected late in 2004.

***Urban densities:*** Under the Growth Management Act, the City must include provisions to accommodate projected population growth in a manner that reduces sprawl and encourages growth in urban areas that can provide urban services, such as public sewer and water. This should be accomplished through a coordinated approach that plans for development in the urban growth area.

The framework of the Comprehensive Plan is to accommodate 50% of the growth in Winslow and 5% in the Neighborhood Service Centers, with the remaining 45% provided for Island-wide in the open space residential areas. The Comprehensive Plan accommodates the projected population by concentrating the growth in the Winslow area where urban services exist and can service the growing population. As the Island develops, population increases and new growth projections are supplied, the plan must accommodate these numbers and revisions will be necessary. The Comprehensive Plan is a dynamic document that is designed to retain the basic framework for growth and development while also responding to changing forecasts through review and amendment.

The City is a water service provider and a sewer service provider with both the primary water and sewer service areas located in Winslow. Service areas for both the public water and public sewer are dictated by the capabilities of the facilities. Expansion and additions to these facilities are based on several necessary considerations, including programming capital costs within the six-year capital facilities plan.

When the City addresses the new population projections for 2025, an evaluation of the land use densities and the urban services necessary to serve the densities will be conducted and amendments will be made as necessary.

***Critical areas and natural resource lands:*** One of the adopted changes to GMA since 1995 is the requirement that best available science be included in the critical areas policies and regulations, with special consideration given to measures for protecting anadromous fisheries. The policies relating to critical areas are provided in the new Environmental Element and were reviewed in consideration of best available science.

***Essential public facilities:*** Minor amendments are included to the policies addressing essential public facilities to meet the requirements of the GMA Update (RCW 36.70A.200).

***Affordable housing for all income levels:*** GMA requires that the City provide affordable housing to all economic segments of the population, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stocks. The City's 2004 Update includes amendments that address changing local needs associated with the affordable housing program.

***Transportation, including levels of service to meet future needs:*** The 2004 Update includes a revised Transportation Element built on the Island-wide Transportation Study (IWTS). The IWTS is a 20-year vision for the transportation system of the City including a technical analysis of the transportation system, update of goals and policies to reflect GMA Updates and new state law, and development of new level of service standards based on industry standards.

***Shorelines:*** Updates to the City of Bainbridge Island Shoreline Master Program (SMP), adopted in 1996, are being processed on a separate timetable from the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update. The update to the SMP policies began in 2002 and is continuing at least through 2006. State regulations require that the SMP update occur by 2011.

## **2004 Update**

The 2000 Community Values Survey revealed that the community held primarily the same values and vision for Bainbridge Island as had been determined in 1994, and the review and analysis of the Plan indicated that, with the exception of the Transportation Element and to some extent the Water Resources Element, only minor changes were necessary in the goals and policies guiding that vision. Therefore, most of the existing goals and policies within the Plan are retained, with minor amendments to improve clarity, reduce redundancy or reflect new information. Several new policies have been added and some have been incorporated with other policies for organizational purposes. Other policies have been deleted because they are unnecessary or no longer relevant. The Water Resources and Transportation Elements have been updated and reorganized, and the existing environmental goals and policies have been consolidated in a new Environmental Element.

The following summary outlines the revisions to the various elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

### ***Water Resources Element***

The 2004 Update to the Water Resources Element includes a complete reorganization of its goals and policies. This includes the addition of a new introduction, reordering the subjects to follow a logical sequence and adding two new policy sections that address monitoring and public education.

The greatest change in the Water Resources Element is to policies related to the extension of public sewer service. The Winslow sewer service map is amended to designate one service boundary. The previously existing service area map has been the cause of considerable confusion as it had two boundaries that designated a “future service area” and an “existing service area.” This revised sewer service map eliminates the dual boundary, and drops out most of the area previously labeled “future.” In addition, a new Policy SSP 2.7 is added to establish the criteria and process for developing or expanding public sewer systems.

Existing policies pertaining to drinking water are amended to discourage individual shallow private wells, and to clarify the role the City plays in terms of public and private water systems. A major change is the addition of a new policy that provides for administration of the City service area map by the Public Works Department.

Minor amendments are made to the on-site septic system policies, primarily to clarify the responsibilities of the City and the Kitsap County Health District.

An updated Aquifer Recharge map and supporting information are also added to the Water Resources Element. (The map and related information were previously included in the Land Use Element.)

### ***Transportation Element***

Revisions to this element include a new introduction, revised and reorganized goals and policies (including new levels of service for Island transportation systems) and updated information on existing conditions. New information proposed for inclusion in the element is drawn from a

transportation study commissioned by the City to provide direction in meeting state requirements for the Transportation Element update. This study, titled *Island-Wide Transportation Study (IWTS), 2003, JDL & Associates*, is referenced in the Transportation Element and provides current information on the use and function of the Island roadways and recommendations for potential improvements to the transportation system.

The Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP), adopted in 2002, is part of the Transportation Element. No revisions to the NMTP are proposed in the 2004 Update.

### ***New Environmental Element***

Environmental goals and policies related to fish and wildlife, aquatic, agricultural and forest resources, flood and geological hazards, greenways, atmospheric conditions and mining are moved from the Land Use Element to the newly created Environmental Element. Revisions to some of these existing policies are included to increase clarity, reduce redundancy and provide consistency with changed circumstances. Several new policies relating to sea level rise, seismic information, indoor air quality, noise pollution and regional greenhouse gases are also included.

### ***Land Use Element***

As described above, environmental goals and policies previously located in this element have been relocated to the new Environmental Element. Other amendments to land use policies include designating the Rolling Bay Neighborhood Service Center as a special planning area, identifying the Winslow Master Plan Study Area as the target area for accommodating future growth and highlighting the community goal of public acquisition for the Wyckoff site. Policies that designate contract zones are deleted, as are several redundant policies pertaining to flexible lot design.

### ***Land Use Map***

The land use map is amended changing three land use designations: 1) the St. Cecilia Parish property at the corner of High School Road and Madison Avenue is changed to Madison Avenue District (MAD) from Urban Multi-family (UMF); the Webster property located on the east side of Madison Avenue near the intersection of New Brooklyn is changed to Urban Multi-family (UMF) from Semi-urban Residential (SUR); and the property located at the southwest corner of Madison Avenue and New Brooklyn, currently occupied by a mini-storage facility, is changed from Contract Zone-Light Manufacturing (CZ-2) to Business/ Industrial (B/I).

### ***Housing Element***

Language is added to the element to incorporate the GMA definition of “affordable housing” and policies are broadened to include more of the available affordable housing tools, including cottage housing and accessory dwelling units. Specific numeric requirements are removed from some goals and policies in order to provide flexibility and make it easier to adjust the City’s housing programs if necessary. New goals relating to the financing of affordable housing and the monitoring of the City’s housing programs are added.

### *Economic Element*

Minor amendments are made to this element to remove language related to skills development and educational curricula (former Goal 5), as they are not appropriate to this element. In addition, previous language pertaining to fiscal practices of all the taxing districts (former Goal 7), and monitoring and reporting commercial activity (former Goal 8) are removed.

### *Other Elements*

Minor revisions to policies in the Utilities, Capital Facilities, and Human Services elements are also included in the 2004 Update. No revisions were made to the Cultural Element.

### **Public Involvement**

As required under GMA, the City has involved the public in the review and update to the Comprehensive Plan. The 2000 Community Values Survey was the first step to gathering public input in the review. A city-wide mailing was provided to each household on the Island, inviting citizens to participate in the update to the plan.

The Planning Commission held a series of public study sessions, workshops and public hearings on the review and revisions of each of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan beginning in 2000 and concluding in early 2004.

- 51 Planning Commission meetings with study sessions on the 2004 Update
- 9 Planning Commission meetings with public hearings on the 2004 Plan
- 2 Planning Commission open house/workshops on the 2004 Update

The City Council began their review of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update in March of 2004 and held a series of meetings on specific elements of the Plan within the Council subcommittees. A special Council open house/workshop was also held, followed by a series of public hearing at City Council meetings.

- 20 City Council Committee meetings on the 2004 Update
- 1 City Council open house/workshop on the 2004 Update
- 2 City Council public hearings on the 2004 Update

# INTRODUCTION TO THE 1994 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

## AN HISTORICAL PROFILE

The Island land mass was shaped by many natural forces.

Between Rockaway Beach and Fort Ward, 18- to 30-million-year-old sedimentary bedrock thrusts above sea level. Part of the Blakely Formation, this ancient ocean bottom yields fossils of marine life still found on the rock's southern shoreline. North America's steepest gravity gradient is found on the formation's northern edge. The edge stretches across the Sound from Elliot Bay to Eagle Harbor and, in part, accounts for the "Seattle Fault," a potentially active seismic zone. Geologists recently discovered that, about 1,100 years ago, a catastrophic event uplifted the portions of the Blakely Formation 23 feet, causing a tidal wave and likely forming the shoreline shelf that stretches from Rockaway Beach to Crystal Springs. The bedrock yields limited water and makes for rocky beaches.

The Island's north and central areas are sand, clay, and gravel deposits laid down by glaciers during the many Ice Ages felt here, the last as recent as 15,000 years ago. In these deposits have been found the dried remains of ancient rivers that once flowed across this land. One, from Mt. Rainier, flowed near Eagle Harbor before Puget Sound was carved. Another, from the Olympics, ran from Fletcher's Bay to Pt. Monroe before Hood Canal was formed. The Island's best freshwater aquifers are found among the glacial deposits, as are commercial sand and gravel resources, and the occasionally discovered remains of prehistoric forests and elephant-like mammoths. Vast, bountiful tide flats, beaches, and sand spits owe their existence to these deposits and the powerful, life-like balance of the forces of coastal drift- wind, current, and tide.

In geologic time, the climate has seen enormous changes; in recent times, our climate has been mild. Temperatures can range from 0 to 100 degrees, but they rarely reach these extremes. Though rainfall is not as heavy as in other regions (there was a 5-foot snowfall in the 1880s!), cloud cover and mist are more common. Earthquakes in excess of 6 on the Richter scale rock the area every few decades. Four wind storms topping 100 mph-two each from the north and south-have blasted Island forests and seas since 1962.

The people of this abundant inland sea, with its forests of giant ancient trees, were hidden for centuries from the world's navigators, except those with large cedar canoes from elsewhere on the coast. More than 36 Suquamish namesakes throughout Bainbridge recall native island villages, camps, and landmarks, including "Haleelts," the 1,500-to 3,000-year-old petroglyph at Agate Point; and Yeomalt, "the place where the north and south winds do battle," an early description of the area's "convergent zone." The forests, meadows, beaches, and bays teemed with plants and wildlife-deer, shellfish and salmon-that supported a flourishing and sophisticated native culture for several thousand years. Inhabitants of winter villages harvested their needs at numerous seasonal campsites. In May of 1792, some, including an elder named Kitsap, were harvesting rice root, wild

onion and other edible bulbs when HMS Discovery anchored nearby off the south shore.

Captain George Vancouver was charting the coast for King George of England, a last search for the elusive Northwest Passage, when his men and ships anchored for two weeks off today's Bean's Bight. They left English names such as "Restoration Point," "Port Orchard," and "Mount Rainier"; collected botanical specimens; recorded descriptions of the region, including a map showing the Island as a peninsula; and enlisted Kitsap to guide them on their way north.

In 1824, a Hudson's Bay Company survey team again sought Kitsap's help during a visit to T'chookwap (Port Madison) on "Suquamish Bay." They found that Kitsap had gone fishing. And, they found "an opening to the west," Agate Pass.

Seventeen years later, after mapping much of Antarctica and the South Pacific, teams from the U.S. Exploration expedition, under Lt. Charles Wilkes, surveyed the Oregon Territory and put Bainbridge Island on their map -- so named for the captain of the USS Constitution during the War of 1812. Added to the 1841 Yankee map were: Port Madison and Point Monroe (for former presidents); Port Blakely (for another War of 1812 naval hero), Eagle Harbor with Wing and Bill Points; Rich and Agate Pass (for U.S. Ex. biologist and artist), Point White (for the seabird "painted" boulders there), and Point Gordon (not every name stuck-it was already Restoration Point). The surveyors saw Suquamish houses with large potato crops on the east Island shore. Settlers seeking their "Manifest Destiny" soon followed Wilkes' maps to Puget Sound.

Following the '49ers gold rush, several California capitalists sent agents north lured by dreams of building "The Gateway to the Orient" and large stands of giant timber. George Meigs occupied land in 1854 Port Madison and founded Meigs Lumber and Shipbuilding Co. The following year, the U.S. government negotiated treaties with indigenous peoples which established reservations, retained native hunting and fishing rights, provided other considerations, and also paved the way for U.S. Land Office surveys in 1856 and subsequent land claims by an oncoming wave of settlers.

Island settlement centered around two mill towns, Port Madison and Port Blakely, founded a decade later by Capt. William Renton. These mill towns processed timber from throughout the region. Port Madison was the Kitsap County seat in the new Washington Territory until the 1890s. The Island's first newspaper, the Port Madison Weekly Sawdust Gazette, was published in 1878. Both towns had large hotels, schools, foundries, and substantial shipbuilding enterprises. Between 1880 and 1903, the Hall Brothers' Shipyard at Port Blakely built 88 vessels, most of which were large schooners for hauling lumber. The economic depression of 1893 helped close the Madison Mill. Port Blakely milltown grew to become the largest lumber mill in the world by the turn of the century. It closed its doors in the mid-1920s, 57 years after it began, and its buildings were dismantled, recycled, or destroyed.

These international export mills sent northwest lumber throughout the world, and brought seafaring people back to Island towns. Almost every language could be heard in those days. Europe was represented on the Island by newcomers, especially those from Scandinavia, the British Isles, Germany, Italy, Spain, and Yugoslavia. The Pacific Rim was represented by newcomers from Hawaii, China, Japan, the Philippines, and Australia. Even sailors from Africa and South America joined the communities, as did natives from up and down the northwest coast, as well as other North Americans-Nova Scotiamen, Prince Edward Islanders, New Englanders, Californians, and Midwesterners.

In the 1900s, the U.S. Army built Fort Ward at Bean's Point. Four gun batteries and a mine- field in Rich Passage provided coastal defenses for the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard until rendered obsolete by aircraft in the 1930s.

Area lumber mill and Hall Brothers' Shipyard owners moved their shipyards to a large sandspit on Eagle Harbor's north shore in the winter of 1902-03. The name of the town there changed from "Madrone" to "Winslow," honoring brother Winslow Hall. The new shipyard featured a 4,000-ton -capacity cradle and marine railway, the region's largest, built to haul ships from the sea for repair and maintenance. In 1905, across the harbor on Bill Point, the coast's largest wood preservative facility grew. The community there was named Creosote after the coal tar derivative that was shipped around the Horn from Wales for use as a preservative. Treated timber and pile helped build railroad lines, docks, shipyards, power poles, and even the Panama Canal, as the nation and west coast communities grew.

Five hotels and several resorts served visitors to early Island communities. The Port Madison offered elegant dining from the 1860s, the Bainbridge Hotel -- its Tyee Room bar seldom closed -- served Port Blakely. The 40-room Pleasant Beach Hotel with its bowling alleys, swimming pool, billiard room, and pavilion, which hosted everything from church conferences to world championship prizefights, was considered the Coney Island of Puget Sound. The Hotel Winslow and other boarding houses served shipyard workers and visitors. The hotel at the Manitou Park Chautauqua grounds on Skiff Point held visitors who came to hear the likes of William Jennings Bryan and John Phillips Sousa. Residents and off-Islanders, alike, flocked to other seaside resorts with popular dance pavilions such as Eagedale's and Fosters' Resort at Fletcher Bay.

Water transportation determined early development patterns. The county's first commissioner declared that every shore road would go to the water, thus the Island's legacy of road ends every half-mile or so around the Island. At first, residents hailed steamers from rowboats, then floats, and finally docks. Communities grew around some 30 mosquito fleet landings and residents knew their captain's whistle signature. Everything from cows to the first Model T Ford automobiles came by steamer. The Sound's worst maritime accident, the sinking of the Dix, cost the Port Blakely community 38 lives in 1906. Car ferry service began by barge from Point White to Retsil. Regular car service to Seattle commenced in 1923 from Port Blakely and about the same time between Fletcher's Bay and Brownsville. In 1937, Seattle car ferry service moved to Eagle Harbor.

Eleven neighborhoods had their own schools until Islanders voted to consolidate in the 1920s. The county's first school was in Port Madison. High schools formed at Port Madison and Winslow as early as 1914 and were merged in 1928 to create Bainbridge High. An Island-wide network of dirt roads and make-shift school buses made consolidated grade schools possible too. One of the nation's finest private schools, the Moran Preparatory School, a forerunner of Seattle's Lakeside School, served young men from a Manitou Park campus. The Island has seen at least 27 different public schools and over a half-dozen private ones, including Hill's Naval Academy.

Touring theatrical companies and locally produced performances helped keep the arts alive in the early mill towns. Silent films soon played at theaters in Fort Ward, Port Blakely, Manitou Park, and Winslow. In the mid-1930s, at Tudor-styled Lynwood Center, the Island's first sound theater was built and continues today, along with community participation in the arts, crafts, and performing arts.

County agricultural agents actively promoted farming enterprises after World War I. Land clearing with dynamite was taught and stump farms became some of the region's finest strawberry farms. Over a dozen greenhouse enterprises were also successful from around 1900 until World War II. Farmers of Japanese ancestry were leaders in and pioneered many of these enterprises.

The world depression hit the Philippine Islands before the United States and a second group emigrated from that country in the late 1920s. The first group came to work in the early lumber mills. The WPA drained Island swamps, graded ball fields, and helped build a Boy Scout camp. Islanders promoted a larger public works dream -- an Agate Pass Bridge. An empty Fort Ward was used to house homeless children.

In 1938, the U.S. Navy took over Fort Ward from the Army, confiscating several surrounding properties and evicting their owners. Large acreages were put into antenna fields overnight as a top-secret, international, radio listening station was built. Radio communication and code schools were also established that lasted through the Korean War. The Fort Ward command also oversaw the construction of the Navy's largest radio transmitter at Battle Point with a tower 300 feet taller than the Space Needle.

With the attack on Pearl Harbor and the commencement of World War II in the Pacific, the Island was hit hard. Bainbridge became one of the first communities required to respond to Executive Order 9066 which uprooted those of Japanese ancestry, most of whom were U.S. citizens, and forced them to move inland. A majority spent the war interred in one of several camps, while some enlisted in the Army. Editors of *The Bainbridge Review* kept Islanders up to date on the activities of displaced residents during the war and regular columns appeared from the internment camps. Editorials pointed out violations of the Bill of Rights inherent in the Executive Order. More than half of the uprooted Japanese-American families returned home after World War II. Winslow's shipyard workers labored round-the-clock, especially on the construction of almost two dozen Minesweepers, and car ferry service was initiated from Point White to Bremerton to accommodate Navy shipyard workers.

In honor of the young men who lost their lives in World War II, Island residents raised funds for a Living Memorial Field at the high school. With only hand tools, the world's largest public school student-built project, a 1,000 seat grandstand, was erected for the memorial by carpentry trade classes between 1947 and 1951.

Winslow incorporated in 1947, developed water and sewer utilities, and became the Island's urban center none too soon. The Agate Pass Bridge became a reality in 1950 and with it the Island's first highway, year-round real estate office, bank, and shopping center. The Army returned to install a Nike missile base and radar station. The Washington State Ferries took over the old shipyard and Winslow, and with the completion of the Hood Canal floating bridge, became a busy connector to the Kitsap and Olympic peninsulas.

## **The Island Today**

The once rural landscape began yielding to residential pressures as events such as the Seattle World's Fair led to the Island's continued "discovery." In some areas, summer cabins became year-round residences and berry farms became golf courses surrounded by cul-de-sacs. The Island has three privately owned courses. Two courses are the region's oldest -- Country Club and Wing Point. An Island-wide park district was formed in 1965, transforming former military lands and

preserving other lands for recreational purposes, including a swimming pool. The State Parks acquired the Fay property near Port Monroe and waterfront portions of Fort Ward. Today, the fort is a National Historic District, one of at least ten historic areas and part of the 200 properties on the State's Island historic resource inventory. Archaeological sites also remain and are protected by state law.

Today, the skyline is lower -- forests have been logged two or even three times. Islanders voted to purchase Grand Forest from the state. Few salmon return to spawn in local streams and paralytic, shellfish -- poisoning toxins are now recorded periodically within the Sound. Since 1970, commercial divers have harvested geoducks from newly discovered deep-water beds. The largest industry is aquaculture. Disease resistant Atlantic salmon are raised by Norwegian specialists in floating pens off Fort Ward.

Environmental concerns led to the closure of the Island's oldest industry, the creosote wood preservative plant. New, land-based industrial efforts produce such items as commercial fish net systems, sport fishing poles, office furniture, and housing. Farm pursuits focus mainly on wine grapes, berries, produce, and livestock. A seasonal, weekly Farmers' Market offers home-grown produce. The school district is the largest employer, but many Islanders commute to King, and Kitsap County urban centers. Far from being isolated, Islanders play an active role in the world community and value cultural diversity.

Population growth pressures, environmental concerns, and county representation were among the issues that caused residents to study ways of gaining more access to government and more local control. In 1991, Islanders elected to annex all other areas to Winslow and to change the name of their new city to Bainbridge Island.

The forces of change, including this Plan, will continue to shape the Island.

# WHO WE ARE TODAY

## **Socioeconomic Profile**

During the past 70 years, the socioeconomic character of Bainbridge Island has undergone more than one significant transition. The once self-sufficient population supported almost solely by abundant timber resources changed, as the timber supply dwindled, to a primarily agrarian society. With the advent of more efficient access, provided by increased ferry service and a land bridge, the transition to a commuting society began and continues today.

Today, Bainbridge Island is a community that embraces and values many diverse lifestyles. The Island is home to artists, farmers, retirees, homemakers, live-aboards, residents who work in retail and manufacturing, and those who provide professional services. In 1990, over 95% of the Island residents were listed as white. Those of Asian ancestry (Japanese, Filipino, and Vietnamese) formed the largest minority.

Over 17,000 people currently live on Bainbridge Island. This number represents the addition of an average of 350 to 400 persons per year since 1970. From 1980 to 1990, the population of Bainbridge Island grew by 3,532 persons, or 28.7%

The following table shows population growth on Bainbridge Island since 1970:

Year	1970	1980	1990	1993	2000	2010
Population	8,494	12,314	15,846	17,200	19,309	21,846

While the population has continued to grow, average household size has decreased from 2.7 persons per household in 1980 to 2.5 persons per household in 1990 and is expected to decrease further over the next 20 years to 2.4 persons per household by 2010. This means that, though population growth may slow, the growth in the number of housing units may remain steady.

Employment increased on the Island by 46% between 1980 and 1990, from 2,360 jobs to 3,460 jobs. The retail sector accounted for the majority of this, registering a 78% increase in the 10-year period, followed by services which increased 40%. Manufacturing employment has been steady, about 300 jobs for the period. Most of those jobs are with three major employers in the Day Road light manufacturing area: Nor'Eastern Trawl Systems, Watson Furniture and Sage, Inc.

Although accurate figures are not available, the Community Values Survey conducted in 1992 indicates that of those who work outside the home, 39% work on Bainbridge Island, while 58% commute off-Island to work. In contrast, there are an estimated 800 people engaged in or employed by home occupations on the Island.

## *Community Values*

From the town meetings, telephone surveys, and focus groups, which were all part of the Comprehensive Plan's visioning process, a profile of the community's values emerged: most Islanders value the sense of community which is a part of Island life, the diversity of its residents (age, ethnic background, and socioeconomic) and the Island's rural character and natural systems. These values are illustrated in the variety of responses by Island residents to the following two questions:

- (1) What do you love about Bainbridge Island?
- (2) What two things do you most want to preserve on the Island?

### *Value the People Who Live and Work on the Island*

- Diversity of people - age, ethnically, socioeconomically
- Acceptance of diversity
- Dynamic
- Self sufficient
- Informal, relaxed attitude
- Respect for privacy/individuality

### *Community*

- Citizens can shape policy
- High level of community involvement
- Small-town atmosphere where people know each other and there is a sense of community
- Lack of municipal structure
- Diverse landscape and diverse architecture
- Narrow, two-lane roads, with no sidewalks
- Dark nights
- Safe community, with low crime rate
- Quiet, slower pace
- Seeing farms around the Island and eating local produce

### *Natural Environment*

- Rural character (forested areas, open space, meadows, farms, with a variety of wildlife)
- Water orientation, as an Island
- Natural beauty, abundance of nature with wildlife
- Woods, animals and plants
- Public access to shoreline
- High quality drinking water, in sufficient quantity
- Trees along ridgelines
- Wetlands and streams

*Transportation*

- Good transit system
- Bicycle lanes and paths
- Pedestrian paths
- Narrow, two-lane roads
- Scenic quality of SR 305
- Water trails for kayaks and canoes
- Horse trails

*Public Services and Facilities*

- Open, responsive government
- Quality schools
- Provide services for the special needs of Island residents (elderly center, teen/youth center, crisis assistance, emergency services)
- Planning for future potable water needs of the Island

# PLANNING UNDER THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

## **Bainbridge Island's Plan for Managing Growth Through the Year 2012**

It was an important year for Bainbridge Island in 1990! The citizens of Bainbridge Island voted to annex the unincorporated area of the Island into the City of Winslow, and the state legislature enacted the Growth Management Act (GMA). The coming together of these two events has been a valuable coincidence for Bainbridge Island. The GMA requires a community to look into the future at least 20 years and answer a number of questions:

1. What should our community look like in 20 years?
2. How can the community accommodate growth and still ensure that its vision will become a reality?
3. How can Bainbridge ensure that citizens of all ages and socioeconomic backgrounds will be able to live on the Island in the future?
4. What services will be needed in the future - transportation, schools, fire, parks, police?
5. How will those services be paid for?
6. What is Bainbridge Island's regional responsibility?
7. What are the best ways to keep the plan up to date?
8. How can Bainbridge Island continue to foster citizen involvement and communication between officials, community members and City staff?

These are important questions for a new all-Island city to address. The next 20 years will bring more residents to Bainbridge Island and will challenge this community to manage the growth in a way that is beneficial for both present and future residents. The challenge will be to preserve the quality of life most residents now value so highly, while accommodating future growth.

Managing growth can take many forms. However, if growth management is to succeed, it must be directed toward a common set of goals. The challenge for the future of Bainbridge Island is to accommodate growth in a way which is true to the community's vision and goals for the future of the Island. This is the objective of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan provides a set of common goals and policies designed to help achieve them. The goals and policies were developed through the combined

efforts of residents, elected and appointed policy makers, and the City staff. This goal-policy framework, taken in conjunction with the accompanying Land Use Designation Map, provides the common direction that is necessary for effective growth management, and is a guide to future actions and development on Bainbridge Island. City regulations will be modified to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

## **A NEW TYPE OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN – The requirements of the Growth Management Act**

Under the GMA, the fastest growing counties in the state (and the cities within them) are required to plan extensively to manage growth. The Act requires jurisdictions to prepare, adopt, and implement a comprehensive plan.

A comprehensive plan must accommodate a 20-year growth projection as prepared by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). Counties, in coordination with cities and towns, are required to designate as Urban Growth Areas (UGA) those areas where population growth is to be accommodated. Under GMA, a city is an urban growth area. Since Bainbridge Island is a city, the entire Island is an urban growth area. Although Bainbridge is an urban growth area, the GMA provides enough flexibility to allow the Island to satisfy the requirements of the GMA and still achieve the vision and goals of the Island residents: to preserve the Island's character, protect its water resources, and foster the diversity of its residents.

While the GMA contains a number of planning requirements which form the framework of the Act, within that framework the vision of each community can be accommodated. The GMA provides for a "bottoms up" planning process which implicitly recognizes the variations and diversity of each local jurisdiction. The GMA has three key components:

### *Comprehensiveness*

The comprehensive planning process must now be an integrated one. The plan must, at a minimum, address land use, housing, transportation, utilities, and capital facilities. To accomplish this, *comprehensiveness* requires a new level of coordination and cooperation between the City and the three special-purpose districts on Bainbridge Island (Fire District, School District, Parks and Recreation District) and Sewer District, and between the City and its residents and the other local jurisdictions of the County and their citizens.

### *Concurrency*

Under the provisions of the GMA, development cannot occur until transportation facilities are available to serve the development once the impacts of that development occur, or within a specified time, thereafter (concurrency). The concurrency requirement in the GMA is specifically applicable to transportation facilities. With respect to facilities other than transportation, each local jurisdiction must determine which other public facilities should be subject to the *concurrency* requirement. The Washington State Department of Community Development (DCD) Guidelines recommend that at least domestic water and sanitary sewer systems be added to the concurrency list applicable within urban growth areas, and at least domestic water systems be added for lands outside of urban growth areas.

The City has chosen not to adopt specific Water and Sewer levels of service at this time. However, public water systems (two or more connections) must comply with all State and Federal laws concerning construction of water systems and water quality monitoring. In addition, the GMA required the City to determine that adequate water supplies exist prior to the approval of a building permit.

In order to achieve *concurrency*, each jurisdiction must develop a six-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) consistent with the comprehensive plan. Furthermore, the CIP must identify the source and commitment of public funds for needed facilities. If funds are inadequate to meet identified needs, jurisdictions must discuss how additional funding will be raised, or how land use assumptions will be readjusted to ensure that level of service standards will be met.

To help jurisdictions meet funding requirements, the GMA authorizes counties, cities, and towns to impose impact fees on development as part of the financing of public facilities. It also allows jurisdictions to adopt a 25% increase in the state sales tax to assist in providing required services. However, the level and method of funding is to be determined as part of the comprehensive planning process.

### *Consistency*

The Comprehensive Plan, itself, must be internally consistent. All parts of the Plan must fit together so that no one feature precludes the achievement of any other. In addition, the Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with the comprehensive plans of jurisdictions with common borders or related regional issues.

County-Wide Policies and Plan: The first step in interjurisdictional consistency is to ensure that the Bainbridge Island Plan is consistent with the Kitsap County-Wide Planning Policies. Kitsap County's Plan was not complete when this Plan adopted. When Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan is complete, the City will need to review the County's plan to ensure that the plans of the City and the County are consistent, as required by RCW 36.70A.100. The County-wide policies are based on Vision 2020, a regional plan, and the findings of the 1990 Kitsap County Growth Symposium.

Multi-County Policies: Under the requirements of the GMA, Pierce, Snohomish and King County developed multi-county policies. In 1992, the Kitsap County Commissioners voted to have Kitsap County included within the area subject to the multi-county policies. The multi-county policies were adopted in 1993. The City's Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with these policies.

## **GMA Goals**

The GMA contains 13 goals. The goals are not listed in order of priority, but must be used to guide the development of comprehensive plans. Each community's comprehensive plan must show how the goals are addressed, consistent with the community's vision for the future. The 13 goals are:

1. *Urban Growth*: Encourage urban growth in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner.
2. *Reduce Sprawl*: Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.
3. *Transportation*: Encourage efficient multimodal transportation systems that are based on regional priorities and coordinated with county and city comprehensive plans.
4. *Housing*: Encourage the availability of affordable housing to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.
5. *Economic Development*: Encourage economic development which is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promotes economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, and encourages growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.
6. *Property Rights*: Private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners shall be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.
7. *Permits*: Applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability.
8. *Natural Resource Industries*: Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including productive timber, agricultural, and fisheries industries. Encourage the conservation of productive forest lands and productive agricultural lands, and discourage incompatible land uses.
9. *Open Space and Recreation*: Encourage the retention of open space and development of recreational opportunities, conserve fish and wildlife habitat, increase access to natural resource lands and water, and develop parks.
10. *Environment*: Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water.
11. *Citizen Participation and Coordination*: Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.

12. *Public Facilities and Services*: Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development shall be adequate to serve the development at the time the development is available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.
13. *Historic Preservation*: Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance.

### *A Dynamic Process*

This Plan is designed to be dynamic rather than static, to accommodate changing conditions which are impossible to foresee. The Plan will be subject to periodic review and refinement to ensure the quality of life that the people of the Island desire. The GMA anticipates an evolving comprehensive planning document. It requires a review of the Comprehensive Plan at least every five years, but limits amendments to once a year.



# DESCRIPTION OF THE PLANNING PROCESS – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

## **Phase 1 – Citizen Advisory Committee**

Involvement in civic activities is an integral part of living on Bainbridge Island. The GMA requires early and continuous citizen participation; the citizens of the Island would have been involved regardless of any requirement of the GMA.

To ensure that the citizens of Bainbridge were involved in the comprehensive planning process from the very beginning, the Mayor and City Council created a seven-member, citizen advisory committee to oversee the development of a comprehensive plan. A nominating committee was appointed by the City Council to select candidates for the advisory committee.

In December 1990, based on the recommendations of the nominating committee, the advisory committee -- the Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee (CPAC) -- was appointed to develop a new comprehensive plan for the entire Island which would comply with the Growth Management Act (Resolution 91-03). The new plan would supplant the existing Subarea Plan for the unincorporated portion of the Island and the existing Winslow Comprehensive Plan.

One of the responsibilities specifically assigned to CPAC in Resolution 91-03 was "to obtain broad community participation including, but not limited to, accepting written comments, and conducting public hearings." CPAC used a variety of methods to obtain broad community participation.

### *Development of the Vision and Overall Goals of the Plan*

The Comprehensive Plan comprises a set of community choices based on a common vision. That vision can only be realized if it truly represents the citizens of the community. Therefore, CPAC's first effort was to try to obtain a community vision and overall goals which would guide Bainbridge Island in the future.

### **Town Meetings**

A town meeting on December 5, 1990 kicked off the visioning process. On April 17, 1991, CPAC held a second town meeting which focused on developing a vision for the future of Bainbridge. CPAC sought answers to the following questions from the over 140 participants:

- 1) What do you love about Bainbridge Island?
- 2) What two things do you want to most preserve on the Island?
- 3) What services do you want to see on the Island?
- 4) What method of transportation do you see yourself and the people of Bainbridge Island using?
- 5) If the Island needs to accommodate more growth, where should the growth occur?

Two additional town meetings were held in August 1991 to continue the visioning process and more than 100 citizens attended. These meetings included not only a presentation to the public, but also a workshop format in which the citizens who attended met in small groups to discuss

the issues of the meetings. Participants of the small groups prioritized community themes and values which were identified at the April 14 town meeting.

### **Citizen Participation Workgroup**

A 17-member citizen participation workgroup was established to assist CPAC with its citizen participation efforts. The focus of the workgroup was assisting at the town meetings and developing the telephone survey.

### **Telephone Survey and Focus Groups**

To further its effort in developing a vision and overall goals for the Comprehensive Plan, CPAC sought to affirm that views obtained from public meetings represented the views of the community at large. CPAC met with staff from the Washington Department of Community Development to determine the best method to use. A random telephone survey was chosen since it would ensure that a cross-section of Islanders would be represented. CPAC members and the citizen participation workgroup worked with a consultant, Pacific Rim Resources, to develop the survey. As a result, a sample of 402 Island residents were contacted through the survey. The findings of the survey were published in *The Bainbridge Island Community Values Survey Summary of Findings*, by Pacific Rim Resources, Inc. (See Appendix)

One of the results of the telephone survey indicated that significant differences existed in how residents felt about growth on the Island. Consequently, CPAC determined that the survey should be followed up with six focus groups consisting of: one group with only citizens who lived on the Island more than 16 years; one group with only citizens who lived on the Island less than 16 years; three mixed groups; and one group of business people. Seventy-two people, primarily chosen from the telephone survey, were contacted to participate in the focus groups; 51 people actually participated. The results from the focus groups were published in *The Bainbridge Island Community Values Focus Groups Summary of Findings*, by Pacific Rim Resources. (See Appendix)

Based on the information drawn from the town meetings, the CPAC regular meetings, and from the telephone survey and focus groups, CPAC developed a Vision Statement and Overall Goals for the Comprehensive Plan.

### ***Development of Inventory of Critical Areas and Natural Resource Lands and the Environmentally Sensitive Areas Ordinance as Mandated by GMA***

CPAC members spent over six months working with members of the community to develop an inventory of critical areas and natural resource lands. The August 1991 town meetings provided Island residents an opportunity to review the inventory maps and comment.

An Environmentally Sensitive Areas Ordinance Committee (ESAC) was appointed by the Mayor and City Council in 1991 to develop a draft Environmentally Sensitive Areas Ordinance (ESA). The workgroup consisted of representatives of farming, logging and environmental interests, a member of the Home Builders Association, a horticulturist, a professor of geography with expertise in physical geography and mapping, and two members of the City's

Planning Commission. The workgroup met for approximately eight months during which time they reviewed available technical information and the work of other jurisdictions related to environmentally sensitive areas regulation. The workgroup produced a draft ordinance toward the end of 1991. The ESA was adopted by the City in 1992 based on the recommendations of the ESA Advisory Committee.

Both the farmland inventory and the Agricultural Lands section of the Land Use Element were developed with the assistance of members of Rural Bainbridge Island and the Bainbridge Island Grange.

### **Development of the Land Use Element**

CPAC reviewed the 1989 Bainbridge Island Subarea Plan and the 1987 Winslow Comprehensive Plan in order to build on the most recent works of the community. CPAC also reviewed the 1992 Bainbridge Island Land Use Inventory which describes existing land uses and future land capacity.

Based on the Vision Statement and Overall Goals, citizen comments, and the existing plans for Bainbridge, CPAC and the City planning staff developed four conceptual land use alternatives, with the assistance of Hennigar and Ray (consultants retained by the City). These alternatives provided four different patterns of development to accommodate growth over the next twenty years:

*Winslow Concentration Alternative:* This would concentrate growth in Winslow through infill development and expansion of boundaries. Within walking distance of the center of Winslow, mixed-use development to enhance the vitality of the downtown would be encouraged. In this core area, new development would be designed at a walkable, visually interesting, human scale. Outside the urban area, a distinctive rural landscape would be retained, including small farms, low-density residential development, low intensity recreational uses, and the preservation of natural and historic features. Development would be limited through a combination of incentives such as Transfer of Development Rights (TDRS), bonus densities, and conservation easements, as well as disincentives such as downzoning and more restrictive development regulations.

*Village Concentration Alternative* - This would distribute the Island's growth to Winslow and the villages of Island Center, Lynwood Center and Rolling Bay. Additional villages or smaller hamlets could be established within this concept as well. Winslow would continue to be the heart of the Island, but would not be as densely developed as under the Winslow concentration concept; increased density would occur through infill and redevelopment. The housing densities within the existing villages would be higher than they are now, and their boundaries would be increased in size. Any new villages would have similar characteristics. These mixed-use villages would consist of two to three hundred housing units with small-scale, commercial establishments. Outside Winslow and the villages, a distinctive rural landscape would be retained, including small farms, low-density residential development, low intensity recreational uses, and the preservation of natural and historic features. Development would be limited through a combination of incentives such as Transfer of Development

Rights (TDRS), bonus densities, and conservation easements, as well as disincentives such as downzoning and more restrictive development regulations.

*Modified Urban Concentration Alternative:* This would be a composite of the Winslow concentration and the village concept. It would retain Winslow as the heart of the community and would permit a slight increase in permitted densities within the villages of Island Center, Rolling Bay, and Lynwood Center. Increase in density in Winslow would occur through infill and redevelopment. Small-scale, commercial development in village centers would serve the surrounding community; Winslow would remain the sole location to support a full range of commercial services. This alternative would differ from the preceding two alternatives in that it would permit more development within the interior portions of the Island, provided that the development is sensitive to the rural landscape and preserves significant amounts of open space.

*Current Zoning Policy:* This would permit development of up to 14 units per acre within portions of Winslow. Commercial development would be permitted in Winslow and Island Center, Rolling Bay, and Lynwood Center. The interior of the Island would predominantly be zoned for 2.5 acre lots, with the existing development pattern in some areas at one or two units per acre. Under this concept, much of the growth would be allocated to the interior portions of the Island where significant amounts of vacant land are available for development. Much of the growth over the next twenty years would occur in a rural residential pattern, spread outside of Winslow and the villages.

On June 30, 1992, a town meeting was held to present these four conceptual land use alternatives to the citizens and to obtain feedback from the over 300 citizens who attended.

Simultaneous with CPAC's work, efforts to develop a county-wide greenways plan were underway. Kitsap County obtained funding to develop a county greenways plan. To develop the plan, the county established north, central, and south county greenways citizens' committees. Bainbridge Island has several members on the north county committee who established a 13-member Bainbridge Island Greenways Committee. This committee helped draft the greenways goals and policies which were incorporated into the Land Use Element and would assist in the development of the Greenways Master Plan. CPAC participated in several other efforts toward development of a greenways plan. In April 1992, CPAC co-sponsored with the Bainbridge Island Land Trust, a workshop to identify open space on the Island.

A two-day Greenways Conference was held on July 30 and 31, 1992. Representatives from the City, the School, Parks and Fire Districts, land use professionals, developers, architects, community groups, and environmentalists attended. Randall Arendt, a nationally recognized expert in preservation of the rural landscape, made several presentations. Participants at the conference discussed creative concepts to accommodate growth without sacrificing the open space, farmlands, and other sensitive areas of the Island. The discussions at the conference provided guidance to CPAC in development of the Land Use Element. CPAC then co-sponsored three Saturday morning workshops with Rural Bainbridge Island and the Bainbridge Island Grange to discuss the results of the two-day Greenways Conference.

CPAC also held four meetings to focus on certain geographic areas of the Island (north, central, south, and Winslow) in order to obtain comments on the four land use alternatives, and any other comments or concerns from citizens living and/or working in particular areas of the Island.

Other methods to communicate with Island residents were also used. In the telephone survey, over half of the participants indicated that the local newspaper was the best method by which to communicate to them. Therefore, CPAC worked with the two local newspapers to provide articles on important issues which were being considered by CPAC. One of the local newspapers printed a series describing the four land use alternatives. The remainder of the survey participants cited a letter-in-the-mail as the best way to communicate with them. Several all-Island mailings in the form of the City newsletter were used to inform citizens of the Comprehensive Plan process. CPAC also communicated with the citizens of the Island through presentations to a variety of groups, including the Rotary and Kiwanis Clubs, Team Winslow, Land Use Professionals Forum, Rural Bainbridge Island, Association of Bainbridge Communities, and South Bainbridge Community Association. CPAC members set up a Comprehensive Plan booth at the Community Services Fairs in 1991 and 1992 and at the Kitsap County Department of Community Development (DCD) Fair at Kitsap Mall in 1992.

Hennigar and Ray, along with City planning staff, worked with CPAC to develop the Draft Land Use Element, dated January 25, 1993. This draft was developed as an "hypothesis" against which the other elements of the Plan would be tested. The draft Land Use Element was also to be reviewed in light of additional information, including the critical areas/natural resources inventory.

While CPAC received written comments throughout the process, comments on the Draft Land Use Element were specifically solicited during February and March of 1993. In cooperation with CPAC, both local newspapers printed a series of articles describing the major land use changes proposed by CPAC in the January 25 draft. CPAC received over 114 written comment letters on the Draft Land Use Element, as well as comments during its regular meetings. The comments were both summarized in table form and were integrated into a copy of the Draft Land Use Element in order to provide CPAC with an easy means of reviewing the comments in relation to specific policies.

Throughout May and June of 1993, CPAC revised the Draft Land Use Element based on comments from the public, review of the critical area/natural resource maps and the information in the drafts of the other elements of the Plan.

Based on CPAC's comments, City planning staff prepared a revised Draft Land Use Element which became part of the July 30, 1993 Draft Comprehensive Plan.

### **Developing the Housing Element**

The City planning staff drafted a Housing Needs Assessment, based on information obtained from the Puget Sound Regional Council, the 1990 Census, the work of the Phoenix Group (consultants retained to develop the County's Needs Assessment), The Kitsap County Housing Affordability Strategy, The City of Bainbridge Island Land Use Inventory - 1992, The Kitsap County Real Estate Trends Report - 1992, and information obtained from Helpline House.

An 11-member Housing Advisory Committee was formed to review the Draft Housing Element based on the information obtained from the Housing Needs Assessment and the vision and overall goals developed by CPAC. The Committee was composed of representatives from the real estate, banking and development industries, an attorney, a representative from the providers of services to special needs population, and members of the Affordable Housing Task Force (an earlier committee appointed by the City Council).

Using the work of the Housing Advisory Committee, a Draft Housing Element was prepared and forwarded to CPAC. CPAC reviewed and revised the work of the Committee and a draft element was prepared on May 27, 1993 which incorporated CPAC's comments. The Housing Advisory Committee reviewed the May 27 draft and recommended several changes which were incorporated into the July 30 Draft Housing Element.

## **Developing the Water Resources Element**

### *Water Goals and Policies*

A 10-member Water Resources Advisory Workgroup was appointed by the City Council to assist CPAC in developing the portions of the Comprehensive Plan which address the Island's water resources. The workgroup included several hydrologists, a geophysicist, and representatives from several water purveyors. One member had served on the County's Island Water Committee and along with a second member of the workgroup on the Kitsap County Groundwater Advisory Group.

The workgroup began by educating its members about the technical issues (hydrogeological) and by obtaining existing data and resources. This included collecting data from the United States Geological Survey (USGS), Kitsap County PUD #1, the Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District, and State Departments of Health and Ecology. The workgroup also invited a variety of experts to provide technical information. Staff from the Pierce County Health Department, Snohomish County PUD, and the Puget Sound Water Quality Authority (PSWQA) discussed tools which other jurisdictions were using to protect their water resources and then suggested possible, water protection policies. In addition, representatives from the Bremerton - Kitsap County Health District, the USGS, and a hydrogeology firm with extensive knowledge of Bainbridge Island, were invited to participate in a panel discussion on how best to protect the Island's aquifer recharge areas and to prevent mining of the Island's water resources.

A public workshop was conducted for the Water Resources Advisory Workgroup and the general public. Representatives from the State Departments of Ecology and Health, Bremerton -Kitsap County Health District, and Kitsap County PUD #1 explained their agencies' respective roles in the review and approval of the use of water resources.

The workgroup also drafted several issue papers on Groundwater Recharge on the Island and on a Satellite Water System Management Plan.

After identifying keys issues and a general policy direction, the Water Resources Advisory Workgroup held a special public meeting to obtain comments. The workgroup then developed

a set of goals and policies to address water resources protection that was later forwarded to CPAC. CPAC met with the workgroup and then reviewed and revised the goals and policies.

### *Sewer/Septic Goals and Policies*

An 11-member Sewer/Septic Advisory Workgroup was appointed by the City Council to assist CPAC in developing portions of the Comprehensive Plan that concern sewage disposal. The workgroup included a septic system designer, a septic system installer, a civil engineer, a representative of Sewer District #7, a representative of the development community, and a citizen long active in water quality issues on the Island.

This workgroup focused on educating its members about technical issues and on obtaining information about existing data and resources. The workgroup collected data from the Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District, Washington State Departments of Health and Ecology, Sewer District 7, and the City Public Works Department. The workgroup also invited a variety of experts to provide technical information. Staff from the Kitsap County Health District discussed with the workgroup current problems on Bainbridge Island and the direction of future county septic monitoring programs and regulations. In addition, a representative of the Washington State Health Department described changes to state regulation of on-site septic systems. An environmental education specialist provided the workgroup with information on model water quality education programs and discussed tools which other jurisdictions were using to protect their water resources.

The workgroup held a joint public meeting with the Water Resources Advisory Workgroup to solicit public comments on key issues and the general policy direction identified by the group.

Based on the information obtained by the workgroup and the public comments it received, the workgroup developed sewer/septic goals and policies. These were forwarded to CPAC, which then reviewed and revised the goals and policies.

### *Storm Drainage Goals and Policies*

Several members of the Sewer/Septic Advisory Workgroup and the City contract engineer formed a subcommittee to develop storm drainage goals and policies for the Plan. The subcommittee included a representative from the development community and a civil engineer.

The subcommittee reviewed existing data, such as the *Bainbridge Island Drainage Reconnaissance Study*, the *Puget Sound Water Quality Authority Storm Water Manual*, and the work of other jurisdictions. From their review, the subcommittee drafted a set of storm drainage goals and policies, which was forwarded to CPAC. CPAC reviewed and revised the goals and policies.

### *Completion of Water Resources Element*

Both the Water Resources Advisory Workgroup and Sewer/Septic Advisory Workgroups recommended that all portions of the Comprehensive Plan which concern protection of the Island's water resources be incorporated into one Water Resources Element. This would include goals/policies developed by the workgroups and portions of the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements as they relate to water resources.



The City Public Works and Planning staff developed the remainder of the Water Resources Element: existing conditions and deficiencies, future needs, and the cost of improvements. The goals and policies developed by the workgroups and revised by CPAC were incorporated into the July 30 Water Resources Element.

### **Developing the Transportation Element**

An 11-member Transportation Advisory Workgroup was appointed by the City Council to assist the transportation consultant retained by the City, Parametrix Inc., to develop a Transportation Element. The workgroup included a former transportation design engineer and construction planner for the State Department of Transportation, an employee of Kitsap Transit, a structural engineer, the regional administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, a municipal attorney, and citizens interested in transportation issues.

In an effort to collect information needed to develop a Transportation Element and to complete a number of short-term tasks requested of the workgroup by the City Council, the workgroup:

- 1) Reviewed all of the bridge/cross-sound studies.
- 2) Reviewed all of the studies and reports on SR 305 and drafted a report to the City Council on the status of SR 305.
- 3) Drafted a report to the City Council on school transportation.
- 4) Conducted an origin/destination study for vehicle ferry traffic on the Seattle/Bainbridge ferry.
- 5) Prepared a bicycle plan.

The workgroup also invited a variety of experts to provide technical information. Staff from Kitsap Transit, Washington Department of Transportation, and the Washington State Ferry System met with the workgroup to discuss their agencies' perspective on transportation issues on Bainbridge Island. A representative from a Seattle firm studying the potential for a foot passenger ferry route from Seattle to Kingston also made a presentation to the workgroup and presented the report the firm prepared for the Washington State Department of Transportation.

Using CPAC's work in developing a vision statement and the overall goals for the Comprehensive Plan, and all the information the transportation workgroup obtained, the workgroup developed transportation goals and policies. The workgroup then held a public meeting to obtain comments on the goals and policies which were later revised in response to the comments.

The goals and policies provided the foundation upon which the Transportation Element is based. The transportation consultant developed, in coordination with the transportation workgroup, CPAC, and City staff, the remainder of the Transportation Element.

A public meeting was organized by City staff and the consultant to address Level of Service issues with representatives from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC), Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO), Washington State Department of Transportation (Highway and Marine Division), Kitsap Transit, and Kitsap County. This multi-jurisdictional Level of Service discussion provided Island residents with an understanding of the implications of various LOS standards.

The workgroup, in consultation with the transportation consultant, developed the Levels of Service methodology for each transportation mode (roadways, transit, ferry, non-motorized transportation, and ferry).

A Roadway Inventory was conducted to assess road characteristics and existing traffic conditions and the LOS for the Island roadways. Improvement costs for pavement management and safety were also provided.

The consultant also identified improvement projects to address future needs and the costs of those improvements.

A May 7, 1993 Draft Transportation Element was prepared by the consultant which CPAC then reviewed and revised. CPAC's comments are incorporated into the July 30, 1993 Transportation Element.

### **Developing the Capital Facilities Element**

A GMA Task Force was formed by the City to address the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Members of the Task Force included staff from the Departments of Planning and Community Development and Public Works, the City Administrator, the City Finance Director, and representatives from Kitsap County Fire District #2, Bainbridge Island School District, and Bainbridge Island Park and Recreation District.

Using the Washington State Department of Community Development's *Guide To Developing A Capital Facilities Element*, the Task Force reviewed the requirements of the GMA and established the method to be used in developing the Capital Facilities Element. Each of the Districts prepared its own comprehensive plan which are included in the appendix of the Capital Facilities Element of the City's Comprehensive Plan.

In 1990, the Bainbridge Island Park and Recreation District conducted a random community survey which involved 320 residents. A more recent survey, the County-wide Recreation Programs and Facilities Survey, was designed and conducted for all of Kitsap County with a Bainbridge Island component. The Park District also appointed a Comprehensive Plan Advisory Committee to assist the District in developing a comprehensive park plan. A Comprehensive Plan was then drafted based on all of the input. Following this, the Park District then held two public hearings on its draft Plan. The draft Plan was revised based on additional citizen comments and coordination with the Kitsap County Park District. During the first quarter of 1994, an additional public hearing was held on the revised draft Plan. The Park District's Board adopted the 1994 Comprehensive Park and Recreation Plan, the Trails Master Plan for Bainbridge Island and the Six-year Capital Improvement Plan.

The Capital Facilities Plan of the School District was derived from the work of a number of committees, including the Long-Range Planning Committee and the Strategic Goals Committee. The School Board held two public meetings on the Capital Facilities Plan. The Master Plan for the main school campus (which is included in the Capital Facilities Plan) was created by an advisory committee of staff and representatives from the public. Five public meetings were held to discuss the Master Plan.

The remainder of the Capital Facilities Element was prepared by the City staff. A Six-Year Capital Improvements Plan was drafted by the City Finance Director. It included the public capital facilities needs on Bainbridge Island over the next six years as identified in each of the Comprehensive Plan elements (city government, water, sewer, parks, school, fire, and transportation).

CPAC made a preliminary review of the draft Capital Facilities Element, including the Six-Year Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). However, CPAC did not have an opportunity to address the concurrency requirement or to assess the financial projections as presented in the CIP. CPAC's comments were incorporated into the July 30, 1993 draft of the Capital Facilities Element.

### **Developing the Utilities Element**

City staff coordinated with utility providers -- Puget Sound Power and Light Company (Puget Power), U.S. West, New Vector Group and Cellular One (cellular phone companies) and Northland Cable, to inventory existing conditions and project future utility needs. (The City water and sewer facilities are addressed in detail in the Water Resources Element.) A 10-member Solid Waste Citizen Advisory Workgroup was created by the Mayor and City Council. The workgroup developed a Solid Waste Disposal Plan which was incorporated into Kitsap County's Solid Waste Plan.

The Kitsap County Electric Facilities Plan prepared by Puget Power was used as a starting point for drafting goals and policies for the Utilities Element. These were then revised by City staff. CPAC reviewed the Draft Utilities Element and its comments were incorporated into the July 30, 1993 draft of the Utilities Element.

## **Phase II – Planning Commission**

In August 1993, the Planning Commission began its review of the Comprehensive Plan with a presentation by staff that provided an overview of the Draft Comprehensive Plan and an identification of some of the major issues which would need to be addressed by the Commission. The Commission held a joint work session with CPAC to review CPAC's recommendations contained in the July 30 draft. The Commission then toured the Island with Randall Arendt, nationally recognized expert in preservation of the rural landscape.

In order to assess the public's reaction to the July 30 Draft Plan, the Planning Commission held three special meetings to receive public comment. (The testimony from these three meetings was incorporated into the Commission's formal hearing on the Comprehensive Plan.) The meetings were held on September 29 and 30 and October 7 of 1993.

The Planning Commission also held several meetings with the Technical Advisory Workgroups. The first meeting focused on the Water Resources Element. Members of the Water Resources Advisory Workgroup, the Sewer/Septic Advisory Workgroup, a representative from the Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District, City Public Works Department staff, and several water resources experts who live or work on the Island, discussed water resources issues with the Commission. Another meeting was devoted to transportation. Members of the Transportation Advisory Workgroup and representatives from Kitsap Transit, Washington State Department of Transportation and the Washington State Ferry System, along with City Public Works Department staff and the transportation consultant retained by the City, discussed transportation issues with the Commission.

The Planning Commission then scheduled a series of work sessions to review the Plan.

About the time the Commission began to review the Land Use Element, the Vision Winslow Design Workshop was conducted, so the Commission deferred any review of Winslow until the results of the Vision Winslow Design Workshop were obtained. The Design Workshop was the idea of a number of community members as a means of testing the viability of the July 30 Draft Plan recommendations to increase density and commercial opportunity within Winslow. A steering committee was appointed which met for six weeks to organize the Workshop. On December 11 and 12, 1993, over 50 Island design professionals and community leaders in real estate, banking, and development, and representatives of the general public, came together in four working teams. Each of the teams developed plans and drawings to illustrate the recommendations of the July 30 Plan. Overall, each team supported the recommendations of the Plan.

The workshop concepts and drawings were presented to the Planning Commission, the City Council, and the community at large soon after the workshop. The Planning Commission did incorporate many of the recommendations of the Workshop into the Commission's recommendations.

In March 1994, the Planning Commission's preliminary recommendations were published and a public hearing was held to receive public comments on those recommended changes to the July 30, 1994 Draft Comprehensive Plan (except for the Capital Facilities Element which was in the process of revision). The Planning Commission identified a number of issues raised by the public, and reviewed and revised the Commission's recommendations, based on public comments.

The Planning Commission's final recommendations, contained in the March 21, 1994 matrix, were then forwarded to the City Council.

### *Capital Facilities Element*

The Planning Commission did review the July 30 draft of the Capital Facilities Element and held a meeting with representatives from the Fire, School, and Park and Recreation Districts. However, during the Commission's review, the City staff was in the process of revising the Element, in part, as a response to public comments on the July 30 Capital Facilities Element. On March 16, 1994, a revised Capital Facilities Element and Six-Year Financing Plan was produced and submitted to the Planning Commission and the City Council.

On April 14, 1994, a joint Planning Commission/City Council public hearing was held on the Capital Facilities Element. After public testimony was taken, the Planning Commission formally forwarded the March 16 Revised Capital Facilities Element to the City Council with a finding that the Element was incomplete in that it did not "include specific projects that will be needed to make it compatible with the land use decisions (specifically in the areas of cost projections, timing, integration with the Land Use Element, Vision Winslow, and bonding approaches) as will be determined by the City Council when they complete the Comprehensive Plan approval process."

## **Phase III – City Council**

The City Council reviewed the Comprehensive Plan through its committees. Listed below are the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan and the Council Committees that reviewed these:

### ***Land Use Element***

The Land Use Committee reviewed the Land Use Element. The main issues that were considered in detail were: 1) Winslow 2) Light-Manufacturing 3) the Neighborhood Service Centers (NSCs), 4) Port Blakely, and 5) policies that dealt with the areas outside of Winslow and the NSCs. The Committee added policy sections on Siting of Essential Public Facilities, Forest Lands, Mining, and Fish and Wildlife Habitat.

A Greenways Plan was developed by staff based on the Greenways Goals and Policies and utilizing the work of ongoing greenways-related projects (Bainbridge Island Greenways Committee, Bainbridge Island Parks and Recreation District Trails Committee, Road Ends Advisory Committee, Public Works Transportation Committee and others).

### ***Housing Element***

The Human Services Committee reviewed the Housing Element. The main issues that were considered in detail were policies concerning affordable housing: accessory-dwelling units, manufactured homes, manufactured-home developments, and affordable-housing bonus densities. Because some of these issues overlapped with the Land Use Element, the Human Services Committee held three joint meetings with the Land Use Committee.

### ***Water Resources Element***

The Public Works Committee reviewed the Water Resources Element. The Committee dealt with water, sewer, and storm drainage capital improvements in conjunction with the Finance Committee. (See discussion on the Capital Facilities Element.)

### ***Transportation Element***

The Public Works Committee reviewed the Transportation Element. The main issues that were considered in detail were: 1) balancing the need to provide a convenient and safe transportation system with preserving the character of the Island's roadways, 2) regional transportation facilities-SR 305 and the Ferry Terminal, 3) levels of service for the various modes of transportation, and 4) recommendations for pedestrian/bicycle access.

The Committee dealt with transportation system capital improvements in conjunction with the Finance Committee. (See discussion on the Capital Facilities Element.)

### ***Capital Facilities Element***

The Finance Committee of the Council reviewed the March 16, 1994, Revised Draft Capital Facilities Element and Six-Year Financing Plan. In response to the Planning Commission's recommendations and public comments, the Finance Committee reviewed in great detail the capital projects proposed in the Comprehensive Plan and the methods of financing those projects. Many of the projects were water, sewer or transportation system improvements - the jurisdiction of the Public Works Committee. For that reason, the Finance and Public Works

Committee held several joint meetings on the Capital Facilities Element and Six-Year Financing Plan. In addition, the Committee invited representatives of the School, Parks and Recreation, and Fire Districts to discuss their respective capital facilities plans which are adopted by reference as part of the Capital Facilities Element. The Committee also revised many of the policies contained in the Draft Plan.

The Finance Committee then studied, in detail, the City's projected revenues and expenditures and finalized recommendations on funding of the proposed capital projects. Among the options considered were general obligation bonds, limited tax obligation bonds, increased utility fees, new utility taxes, and increases to property taxes.

### *Utilities Element*

The Public Works Committee reviewed the Utilities Element. The Committee determined that the Utility Element needed significant review by the Committee. The main issues considered were: (1) the level of electric reliability to be recommended, (2) the means of achieving reliability, (3) the possible impacts; and the level of cellular service to be recommended. A special work session was held by the Committee to hear from representatives of utility providers (Puget Power, cellular phone companies), representatives from the City's Electric Reliability Committee, and concerned citizens.

During the period in which the Council committees were reviewing the Draft Plan, the full Council met periodically so that each committee could review with the full Council the proposed committee recommendations.

On June 3, 1994, the Council's preliminary recommended changes to the July 30, 1993 Draft Plan, as revised by the Planning Commission, were published. A public hearing was held on June 9, 1994, in order to obtain comments.

The Council committees, and the Council as a whole, reviewed the public comments and revised the Council's recommendations. A June 30, 1994 Revised Council Goals and Policies was prepared, along with a June 30, 1994 Revised Capital Facilities Element and Six-Year Financing Plan. On June 30, 1994, the City Council voted to request staff to prepare a formal resolution in order for the City Council to approve the Draft Comprehensive Plan on August 4, 1994.

## **Remand from the Growth Management Hearings Board**

On May 3, 1995, the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (the Board) issued a *Final Decision and Order* in the case *Robison et al. v. City of Bainbridge Island, Case No. 94-3-0025*. The petitioners alleged that the Comprehensive Plan adopted by the City of Bainbridge Island violated various requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA).

The Board concluded that the C Plan was in compliance with the GMA, with three exceptions. The Board remanded the Plan with direction to correct the following items by November 3, 1995:

- The City must amend its Plan to incorporate the May 1994 population allocation of 6,820 persons from the County or if the County makes a later population allocation, to incorporate that allocation as required by RCW 36.70A.130(3).
- Amend the Capital Facilities Element to include a more localized analysis of the public facilities infrastructure required to support the proposed growth for the Winslow urban core as required by RCW 36.70A.070(3)(b) and (c).
- Remove the word "rural" from the Plan's Overriding Principle #1: "preserve the rural character of the Island."

Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan was prepared to make the corrections ordered by the Board.

### ***Preparation of the Amendment***

On July 7, 1995, the City Council adopted Resolution 95-29 which set out the process the City would use to adopt the Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan mandated by the Remand from the Growth Management Hearings Board. (See Introduction and Land Use Element Appendix I.)

The City prepared an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan that addressed the three issues raised by the Hearings Board.

1. Revised the population allocation to incorporate the latest allocation by the County.

The September 1994 Comprehensive Plan was based on the Kitsap County Regional Planning Council's (KRPC) designated planning horizon of 1990 to 2010 and 20-year population allocation for Bainbridge Island of 21,846 persons. The 1990 Census data showed the population of Bainbridge Island in 1990 as 15,846 persons. Therefore, the 1994 Comprehensive Plan planned to accommodate 6,000 additional persons by the year 2010 (the difference between the 20-year allocation of 21,846 persons from the 15,846 persons on the Island in 1992).

On June 7, 1995, the KRPC amended the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies to revise the 20-year planning horizon under GMA and to revise the population forecast for the

County and the subarea allocation for each of the local jurisdictions within the County. Bainbridge Island was allocated a population of 24,280 by the year 2012. The 1992 Island population was 16,850 persons. With an allocation of 24,280, the Island must plan for an increase in population of 7,430 persons by the year 2012. (See Introduction and Land Use Element Appendix J.) The Plan has been amended to reflect the change in the planning horizon and population allocation. The reanalysis described in paragraph 2 below, also addresses the County changes.

2. The City conducted a more localized analysis of the public facilities infrastructure that will be needed to support the proposed growth in Winslow.

### **Water, Sewer, and Storm Drainage Systems**

R.W. Beck was retained to reanalyze both the Winslow water and sewer systems to determine if there would be adequate water and sewer facilities to accommodate the increased growth allocated to Winslow (50% of the total population allocation).

The City retained Kato & Warren to analyze the 1985 *City of Winslow Storm Water Drainage Plan* and to determine if facilities were adequate for the growth allocated for Winslow.

### **Transportation System**

Kato & Warren was retained to reanalyze the impact, if any, of the changes in the population allocation and planning horizon and reanalyze the Winslow transportation system to determine if there would be adequate transportation facilities to accommodate the increased growth allocated to Winslow.

### **Fire Protection**

The Bainbridge Island Fire District reanalyzed the fire facilities to determine the impact, if any, of the changes in the population allocation and planning horizon and to determine if there would be adequate facilities to serve the increased growth allocated to Winslow.

### **Park and Recreation**

The Bainbridge Island Park and Recreation District reanalyzed the park and recreation facilities to determine the impact, if any, of the changes in the population allocation and planning horizon and to determine if there would be adequate facilities to serve the increased growth allocated to Winslow.

### **School Facilities**

The Bainbridge Island School District reanalyzed the school facilities to determine the impact, if any, of the changes in the population allocation and planning horizon and to determine if there would be adequate facilities to serve the increased growth allocated to Winslow.

3. Overriding Principle “1” was revised.

### *Distribution of the Amendment*

On August 2, 1995, the City's monthly report in the local paper contained an article on the preparation of the Amendment required by the Remand and contained a calendar of key dates for the adoption of the Amendment.

In order to provide additional publicity for the Amendment process, the City's monthly report was also mailed as a newsletter to approximately 70 community organizations.

On August 4, 1995, the Amendment was made available to the public.

The City followed the process set out in Resolution 95-29 to adopt the Amendment.