The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the
Kitsap County Administration Building – Commissioner’s Chambers located at
619 Division Street, Port Orchard, WA 98366.

Members present: Chair Fred Depee, Mike Gustavson, Tom Nevins, Lou Foritano, Jim
Sommerhauser, Linda Paralez and Robert Baglio
Staff present: Katrina Knutson, Eric Baker, Angie Silva and Planning Commission
Secretary Amanda Walston
Members absent: John Hough, John Taylor

9:02:25

A. Call Meeting to Order, Introductions

B. Adoption of Agenda

Depee adopts the agenda as posted.

C. Public Comments

(Depee hears none, moves to next item.)

D. Approval of Minutes

A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by
Commissioner Foritano to approve the minutes of August 12, 2008

Sommerhauser: These minutes seem to be more exact, is that standard or only
because of the public hearing?

Walston: Yes, it was only for the hearing. Public testimony is usually captured in the
minutes verbatim.

Gustavson: That becomes part of the record and carries forward to court issues
if it goes that far.

Depee notes this may be a good point of discussion for the upcoming work
session with legal.

The VOTE:

Yes: Unanimous

Motion Carries
E. Director's Update: Larry Keeton, Director, DCD

Keeton: In staff updates, Jim Bolger left the department to work for the Pacific SHELF Project. His position will not be filled in order to help with budget issues. Linda Jones was promoted to Permit Center Manager.

Another issue we are reviewing is performance measurement. We have received an analysis reporting tool that allows us to track time spent on permits or projects by individual planner or reviewer. We gave the tool to managers and some of the findings were surprising.

Foritano: It sounds like you are managing time and not objectives and accomplishments.

Keeton: We are managing both, which leads me to the other budget issues. The department will face a 1.8 million dollar shortfall due to decline in Single Family Residence applications, which is our main permit fee, though we still have other permits coming in. We are 40% below projection and are now working with the union to find out how to make up this deficit. We are looking at different strategies including hour reduction and layoffs; this will be a different department by the end of the year.

Regarding Code Development, we asked the Board to allow changes to the Use Table because we have too many things that require Conditional Use Permits and Administrative Conditional Use Permits that we would like to see as permitted activities. More importantly, the conditions coming from the Hearings Examiner are the same conditions contained in the code, so it’s already there. We want to bring these changes to you in late December. Next year we will do an actual code rewrite in a variety of places to make it consistent with the comprehensive plan and to fix the rough patches.

Sommerhauser: I sat in at the Board’s afternoon briefing when Keeton and the department presented a docket update to the commissioner. I’d like at least the cover sheet for this document provided to the Planning Commission as well.

Keeton: Yes, we will coordinate that with Amanda. The presentation is basically status. We are trying to update and approve the 2009 docket for 2009 at the same time that we are preparing the budget and funding so it makes sense to plan them together.

Foritano: I’m used to seeing hard edge labor cuts. Have you looked at any creative processes, for example combining work studies or common meetings with the Board?

Keeton: Yes, we have discussed seven scenarios. As I told the board, I would have to cut 17 fee-based staff members in order to recover this deficit through traditional labor reductions. The economy will rebound, it always does, and it’s just a matter of when. We are looking closely at reduction on work week hours and unpaid furloughs. Salaries will be affected across the board, not only directed at permit staff.

Gustavson: I read that the government median salary is $71,000 per year and private sector averages $35,000; one media-hyped solution is to create parity.
Keeton: The private job base includes minimum wage all the way to CEO’s to get an average. If you hire for nine or ten dollars per hour, you get what you pay for and this continues all the way across the public sector’s job base, including law enforcement, planning, inspectors, prosecutors and others. Our County planners make less than their private counterparts.

Gustavson suggests reviewing the editorial.

9:16:55

Baglio: Reduction of Administrative Conditional Use Permits and moving them into permitted has happened a little already. You have a 2 week appeal period; is that how you will do that? I also wonder if that is duplication of the State Environmental Policy Act appeal period.

Keeton: We are looking at different methods and what the legal ramifications may be.

Sommerhauser: The joint hearing you mentioned is not on the schedule.

Keeton: It’s not scheduled, but there is potential for a joint hearing on Code Revision. Staff is developing the Use Table now, we will vet it through advisory and public groups, then it will come to the Planning Commission sometime in late October or November.

Depee: I’d still like to see more accountability on the website as to the individual assigned to a project and when it is submitted to each step. If you go on now, you can’t even tell who the planner is. Staff’s time is being eaten up by chasing down answers to questions that might be as simple as who has what, and then you have calls that go unreturned and more frustration.

Keeton: It will probably stay that way, but we are increasing the information that is available and standardizing processes to make it more efficient, and we have implemented a system to track citizen complaints. The Office Assistant sends a message to the planner or staff member, their manager and also copies my assistant.

We are also changing process. The proposal will be two-fold. You submit an application, you sit down with them, they identify any problems they see, you can work through it with engineers, you can ask for a second submittal, we review it again and we all leave. I want to follow the Yakima model which is very successful.

F. Finding of Fact – Highland Woods Rezone Application: Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD

Knutson reviews the Finding of Fact.

A motion is made by Commissioner Foritano and seconded by Commissioner Paralez to approve the Finding of Fact as submitted.

The VOTE:
Yes: Unanimous

Motion carries.
F. Work Study – Illahee Community Plan: Katrina Knutson, Associate Planner, DCD

(Draft Staff report distributed)

Knutson: The staff report will be finalized after the public comment is received and hearing is over.

Knutson states the staff report will be finalized after public comment is received, and the public hearing has commenced. Reviews purpose and upcoming scheduled public hearing; acknowledges large amount of public participation.

Sommerhauser: Has the City of Bremerton had any regular participants?

Knutson: We’ve been in contact but no direct participation.

Knutson reviews Chapter One regarding purpose and history, public outreach efforts including survey available online and hard copy as requested and identifies boundary on aerial photography map.

Depee questions and Knutson confirms that the Port of Illahee has been represented at every meeting.

Knutson reviews the Growth Management Act and the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.

Knutson: Prior to the 1998 plan, Illahee was zoned rural. The citizens have stated they were unaware of what was happening during the Comprehensive Planning process and the subsequent rezoning to urban. There are no standards on how to set boundaries, but we did use logical guidelines that can be used for Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development and we have 99% agreement on the designation of the boundary.

Sommerhauser questions if the northern boundary extends up to Brownsville?

Knutson: Not quite that far, residents there identify themselves as University Point and did not want to be included in the plan.

Knutson reviews Chapter 3 including historic and residential zoning. Our semi-rural zoning was invalidated by the Growth Management Hearings Board and was sent back to be changed in the Comprehensive Plan Update. The community was unhappy about being overlooked in the 1998 process.

Paralez: What were they unhappy about? What would they have preferred?

Knutson: Their preference in a perfect world would be to be pulled completely out of the Urban Growth Area. We’ve worked really hard in trying to balance these groups with what they want and what Growth Management requires.

Paralez questions and Knutson confirms that they want less density.
Knutson: I think they are very happy with what we have. We eliminated the urban medium zoning, as did the Special Projects office. The City of Bremerton doesn’t have this zone, so we pulled it out of Illahee to be more consistent with the surrounding area.

We are proposing an Illahee Greenbelt Overlay Zone (displays 2005 zoning map and compares to current zoning map, which was adopted through the 2006 Comprehensive Planning Process). You can see how much was downzoned during this process, and the dramatic shift was primarily due to critical areas.

A majority of the zoning was left unchanged, including the area near Wheaton Way and Riddell. The community and the county worked very hard in the 2006 process to get that zoning set and we feel it is working well. (References proposed zoning map) The parks on the map are mainly the Illahee preserve, and the new proposed Illahee greenbelt overlay zone.

Sommerhauser requests and Knutson confirms color maps will be provided before the deliberations.

Knutson: We are proposing a reduction in density from one to five to one to four, and encouraging vegetation restrictions. Illahee’s stormwater issues are similar to Manchester, so we are proposing a similar 40% maximum impervious surface limit. The overlay covers the preserve and it has no density, and we did not want to change the rolling hills golf course. (Identifies on map the greenbelt zone boundary as proposed)

You may wonder how we can decrease density in these zones. We are taking from the Growth Management Hearings Board rulings based on the Litowitz rule, including the Thousand Friends case, which allows specifically for this by identifying specific circumstances that allow for decreased density. Staff and Legal have concurred that we can use this rule as a way to balance the needs of the community and the county’s Growth Management practices. We feel it will provide a higher level of protection for Illahee Creek and the other critical areas.

Sommerhauser requests a map showing the new area and any projects already in progress that will be vested.

Knutson: This zone is not meant to restrict development. If you look in the area covered, the critical areas are so great that it does not allow much. But there are some vested projects. I will provide a map showing these.

9:45:28

Knutson: The community brought forth the issue of view protection and we consulted with the Assessor to see what they define and tax as views (displays map of assessor data view designations) and Jonathan Pavy and I visited the area several times to identify what the community considers view properties. Another consideration should be tree canopy, so the views may not be there at the moment, but if developments were to take place and trees come down, a view may then be opened up.

Nevins: One dilemma I see is that if you are upslope from the treed area and the trees come down, can you then build to 35 feet and block the view that has now opened up?
Knutson: That is a big dilemma and we want to allow two stories with the provision to allow a daylight basement. We can try to create some visual representation of these.

9:49:40

Gustavson questions and Knutson clarifies that height measurement should be made from the midpoint of the slope.

Sommerhauser questions and Knutson confirms that tax title strips will be addressed. Also would like to see if a visit to the area can be arranged. Knutson confirms that if three or more members would like to tour the area, Staff will coordinate the trip. (Gustavson, Foritano and Sommerhauser are all interested)

Knutson: A moratorium has been placed on the sale of tax title strips in specific areas including Illahee, and the Board has stated that citizens should be involved in deciding the acceptable terms of sale.

Illahee citizens agree the county should not be allowed to purchase the land if a structure, such as a house, is present. Decks, yard, sheds or other such things should not be a structure that qualifies for a purchase.

Foritano: Why didn’t this come up in purchase and sale transactions?

Knutson: GIS mapping is not 100% accurate as to actual location and the community wants to retain the tax title strips and rights of way for possibility of future urban growth amenities.

Depee: Has the Parks & Recreation committee given their recommendation? The moratorium is tied to their projects and you may want to be conscious of work done by that group.

Knutson: I met with Commissioner Brown and Larry Keeton yesterday because we are unsure if the Citizen’s Advisory Group should bring forth their current recommendation, or if we need more. Commissioner Brown suggested in the next year that Community Development facilitate the process to figure out the conflicts in these areas. Our department does not have a stake in this, so we’d like to coordinate the players involved and ask them to help identify and map future needs for their capital facilities issues.

9:58:00

Nevins: This seems to have generally positive aspects countywide. One way to get around the moratorium is to make it a countywide rule. I recall one instance where a small piece could have been used for a neighborhood trail to connect it to a recreational area. This could be a minor gain for the property owner and also for the citizens.

Depee: The Parks and Recreation committee specifically review future pathways and anything to do with public participation. It is talked about and I guarantee covered quite thoroughly.
Knutson: Through the process we did note the lack of sidewalks and bike paths is due to lack of funding. The community stated that they would rather keep it as it is now instead of selling it and then having to buy it back later, possibly at an increased price.

Sommerhauser: I sat in on the hearing that prompted the moratorium and there was a big disconnect between what the Parks department and the community viewed as a trail or a path. We need to get the players together on this and I think that is why the Commissioners placed the moratorium.

Depee and Knutson agree.

Knutson: Cindy Read, the department’s GIS technician used to work in the Assessor’s office and when she went through to map the areas, and if we wanted to accurately map where the tax title strips are surveyed at and where they should be, she estimated we would look at a cost of about $40,000 - $80,000.

Gustavson questions and Knutson confirms that would be just for the Illahee area.

10:03:00

Gustavson: On the 40% max impervious surface. Simple math says this leaves 4,000 square feet of pervious surfaces. What is defined as impervious?

Knutson defers to Eric Baker

Baker: Impervious surfaces are generally buildings, driveways and other gravel areas. Lawns are not considered impervious.

Gustavson: Can driveways escape that by using Low Impact Development Standards?

Baker: It can be addressed at time of application, but you should be able to recapture some of that area.

Gustavson: Is clustering allowed in this area?

Baker: It is likely recommended due to the critical areas located on the site. A flat earth straight plat would be extremely challenging.

Gustavson: Does this qualify as a Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development?

Baker: No, it’s an Urban Growth Area.

Gustavson: How many lots are ¼ acre or smaller legacy lots and how does the 40% impervious limit affect those?

Knutson: We do not have a number to provide for that.

Gustavson: We don’t want to turn it into a taking issue by making lots unusable.
Knutson will note these comments.

Foritano: Can you cover some of the references to aquifer concerns that are included in our packet of information?

10:07:00

Knutson: Illahee has raised money and hired many scientific experts over the years. (Displays aquifer recharge map) A report is coming by end of year, but the concern is with the creek’s location in the urban area, and not having enough water returned to the watershed and the base flow has been down in recent years. We are hoping to increase some of the infiltration. There is also much concern about the salmon run.

Foritano: Are there any toxicity issues?

Knutson: It is noted by the Health Department that there are septic failures, but many of those issues have been addressed and the numbers are getting better.

Knutson reviews Chapter 4 (displays bldg limitations map) including geological hazards and wildlife corridor areas as mapped by Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Knutson: There is a substantial movement of wildlife from Illahee state park into the preserve. The tree recognition and preservation portion is currently not mandatory but is a good idea that Staff and the Illahee citizens recommend keeping as written. Open space is highly valued in this community and they see themselves as the central park of Bremerton, with a marked difference from Manette’s very small lots and much developed properties.

(Displays shoreline designation and aquifer recharge area maps)

Knutson reviews Chapter 5 including transportation, which was reviewed heavily by Greg Cioc, Public Works Transportation Manager including an analysis of infrastructure and services. A traffic analysis was also performed, but Illahee Road was washed out in the major winter storm, once repairs are complete, another analysis will be done.

10:13:50

Sommerhauser: Will the new report be available in time for this plan?

Knutson: No, we will have to update later. Greg Cioc also did projection for Levels of Service in 2025. The majority of roads are at Level A now, but we will have Riddell Road at a Level F, and William Boulevard will be a Level D by the end of the projected period. We are hoping that the goals and policies of this plan will help secure grants and funding for the road improvements.

Knutson reviews Chapter 6 including stormwater, provided by North Perry Water Systems, displays stormwater maps identifying the current sewers and current water lines shown in blue. Serious damage exists and has visibly increased on every staff visit to the area.
Foritano: Is there any determination of the cause beyond the storm?

Knutson: Public Works has calculated factors including not enough infiltration, soil types, and clogged pipes at the time; it was a culmination of perfect circumstances that would lend to the flooding. (Displays picture of the culvert coming out to Port Orchard Bay) It was originally a 12.5 foot clearance, over time runoff has caused sediment to settle and reduce clearance to about three or four feet.

(Displays park/open space map) There are no public meeting spaces in the area so they have a need for these as they are a very active community.

Depee: Did they buy the old gas station they were looking at for that purpose?

Knutson: The port has not yet completed a purchase. What they lack in public facilities, they definitely make up with parks and open space areas.

10:21:15

Knutson reviews Chapter 8 including preservation and historical planning information. Appendices will include the resolution requesting the Illahee community plan, a Frequently Asked Questions sheet on determination of height, and survey results which will be concluded the night of the public hearing.

Baglio discloses that Kitsap Mental Health Services is located on the west side of the area, they are currently submitted as a project, of which I am handling the project management for.

Nevins thanks Knutson for providing the meeting summaries, and recommends it as a good method to use for other community groups.

Knutson: The summaries make things easier for us as well. We have time to spend on this plan if you’d like. We are on the schedule to go before the Board November 5th. Please send me any questions or comments you may have.

10:24:52

Depee: Excellent job, you are getting better and better.

(Paralez leaves the meeting)
G. Work Study – Waaga Way Connector Roads: Eric Baker, Special Projects

Baker: (Displays Waaga Way map) There are precious few pro owners who have access off or control of access to this 13 mil roadway improvement. It has bike lanes, pedestrian sidewalks, received federal and state funding. County Commissioners are very interested in establishing connector roads to ensure that more than just the abutting property owners have access so they created additional regional commercial vacant lands including these (References zoning map) industrial lands, regional commercial lands which include The Kitsap Mall and downtown Silverdale, business center including the ball field complex.)

These are meant to be Business Parks, job producing areas. The idea is to create a synergistic area that will help resolve issues of a factory next to an office. Originally, the goal was to move people off Clear Creek Road to improve traffic, now it is to improve public access.

Baker: We have held several meetings and follow-up meetings with those interested in the location of these roads. We want to ensure the market doesn't drive us to a building located in the middle of a connector road or potential proposed site for a connector road.

(Displays topographical map and identifies critical areas)

This was the starting point for the discussion on location of connector roads. The idea is not to increase or promote traffic and the key component is for these lands to be utilized and private investment is the focus. From the community meetings, we created a set of alternative roadway locations.

Alternative 1: (References ALT 1 map) We tried to avoid the critical areas and there is a roadway running through some of the steep slopes on the west portion of the property. The roadway exits out on North Frontier Road near Bison Lane (small public road)

Depee questions and Baker confirms that the property owners have reviewed all of the Alternatives.

Baker: Alternative 2: (References ALT 2 map) This looks at the same connector roads, working around the critical area that held water up until June, but connects with Bison Lane. The idea was to hug the actual topography a little better. This road does run past a series of residential homes.

Alternative 3: (References ALT 3 map) This has the most roadways located throughout and does not take topography into account quite as much, has th most impact to terrain and is greatest in cost. Using the same western road with limited opportunities, this system moves through the wetland complex, which needs mitigation but provides another option for connectivity. It connects to Bison and also includes an East/West connection to Clear Creek Road.

Alternative 4: (References ALT 4 map) While all the other alternatives connected back to Frontier Road, one concern was that if the purpose was to avoid Frontier, why connect to it?
Baker: There is nothing in transportation plan budget for next 6 years to include funding to make Frontier a major roadway. Expense would be fully on the back of developers. We dead end at a point that provides access to all properties north of the area.

We received comment that it is blatantly obvious as to where a connector road needs to be located, but there are limited full motion access points.

Alternative 5: (References ALT 5 map) We took these two roadways and try to hug the State Highway as closely as possible. While it would still need some significant engineering, it would provide the most logical way to help get people through the area. Citizens reviewed this alternative and came up with a revision and preferred alternative, which we refer to as Revised Alternative 4.

Revised Alternative 4: (References Revised ALT 4 map) This has been largely preferred by most of the public and manages to avoid common problems while still providing access and connectivity. After reviewing the critical areas, this is also the preferred alternative from County Staff perspective.

Sommerhauser questions and Baker confirms that this Revised Alternative 4 is the preference of the County and of the majority of the public involved.

10:55:17

Baker: We are very aware that individuals will be trying to aggregate properties, which would make this connector roads superfluous, but the Board wanted to make sure that if that didn’t happen, we would be able to provide flexibility. Let’s say someone wanted to buy all property south of this extension, there is language that allows this to be relocated. The idea being that if these properties are aggregated into one cohesive development, a great deal of flexibility would be afforded to connector road location.

Gustavson: Reading the topographical maps, it appears on the lower left hand stub, you are gaining between 80 and 100 feet of elevation and that may not work; you might want to consider another alternative to running it up that hill.

Baker: These do not take into account the significant amount of grading and walls that will have to happen to the locations of the extension roads themselves and when all is said and done, it would probably be about 40 feet. These locations and options were laboriously discussed with all property owners and at this point access points are set and they prefer this to cutting across wetlands to access their property, which would add time and cost to the process.

Sommerhauser: Is this map showing that the middle of the three access points would be started in the middle of this pond?

Baker: It is manmade and the extension road runs through a mitigated site. Wetlands are not accurately mapped, so we had to specify that the wetlands to the south are much larger, and to the north they are much smaller.

Foritano: This sounds like a very non-controversial public hearing.
Baker: Some will have points of concern. A number of perspectives will be brought forward and some have sophisticated levels of development knowledge, some will be developer/owners, some property owners with projects they want to plan and some who only want to sell. If they know what they want to plan for and build, they can clearly decide what allows them the greatest opportunity. Others don’t want to be prevented from developing or selling the properties in the future. If you aggregated a few of these properties, you can relocate the roadway. We are looking to have a free flowing roadway and to have Public Works, Special Projects and the best planning efforts to work and plan based on what the owners do or don’t want to do with their property.

11:02:55

Baker: This will provide a clear map for them on how they will have to get an extension road into the mix of their development and sale of properties

Depee: Why don’t you just have a submission of requirements for what you do and don’t want in a particular area? For example no stop signs, no 90 degree turns and the like.

Baker: It creates a series of objective requirements and what we would have hoped for the Kitsap Mall if we planned it today, which is a perfect example of why we need a connector road system because as you add in the traffic, it becomes almost impossible to navigate effectively and consistently.

11:05:20

Baker: We’ve also solicited the same comments on the aspects of roadway design including sidewalks, parking, bike lanes and the standard traveled lane. This is not intended to be an arterial; it is to be a collector road. These are the two alternatives that are currently out there and the amalgamation of these two. It is two traveled lanes and two sidewalks on one side of the street. The sidewalk runs along the property lines.

Alternative B shows on-street parallel parking, it is a concern of some of the developers that this be provided. Kitsap County does not currently have this type of parking and the only more complicated option would be angle or reverse-in angle parking.

We are collecting public comments and looking for a recommendation of what this roadway design should look like. This design is as malleable as the location of the road itself, as the development’s features may dictate different parking needs.

Depee clarifies that the public hearing for this will be September 9th.

Baker: Yes, and we will go to Deliberations and Recommendation on September 23rd. This is important to be memorialized; we would prefer not to impose something that creates undue restrictions on the area. We will go to the Board under the same omnibus ordinance that Community Development shepherds.

Discussion continues and it is decided that Waaga Way’s Public Hearing will go before Illahee’s on September 9th.
F. For the Good of the Order: Chair Depee

Nevins: I’m not too concerned about the effect, but if in the future any of us know that we will probably abstain because of our involvement with a project of any level, I think the better thing to do would be to recuse yourself and remove yourself from the room. If we need a quorum, you should stay, but abstaining is not a useful action. As a commissioner, you should be prepared to vote up or down. We need to be comfortable or to make ourselves comfortable with.

Gustavson: A comment that goes along with it, the concept of recusal generally implies that you have financial interest in the project. Is that correct?

Nevins: I certainly understand why you abstained, but if you knew ahead of time and you had recused yourself, it may have affected the quorum.

Depee: That is a good point. I knew in advance that I would abstain based on the proximity of my home. I didn’t feel it was fair to have the public look at it that way. So if I were to say I will recuse myself, what reason would I give?

Sommerhauser: I had a discussion with legal one on one to try to figure this out. And they found the reason you cited for an abstention surprising and didn’t see any reason for it based on the requirements for public service on this panel. A recusal goes further; it is not just based on financial and includes familial interest. If you recuse, you totally exit involvement, it’s not just stepping down from the vote here.

Depee: I did want to hear this feedback. I can speak for myself, I have no problem with that, and if I know in advance, I will supply my reasons to this body and we can determine the appropriate actions.

Foritano: In that regard, I asked the question in the minutes because I like direct open communication. I think we have an obligation to the public and I very much like the expertise of your knowledge.

Sommerhauser: One of the discussions I’ve had with legal is the five vote requirement, and I understand it has a basis in law for only some of our decisions. Some are legislative in requirement and the five votes does not apply there. My question was if either of you had recused yourself, would the requirement have prevailed?

Discussion continues and Depee notes that Shelley Kneip will be at the September meeting to discuss some of these issues.
1
2
3 Sommerhauser asks if a date has been set for the inter-jurisdictional Planning
4 Commission training scheduled for early next year. Nevins would like clarification
5 on what will be presented in the training.
6
7 A motion is made by Commissioner Sommerhauser and seconded by
8 Commissioner Nevins to adjourn the meeting.
9
10 The VOTE:
11 Unanimous
12
13 Motion Carries
14
15 Time of Adjournment: 11:23:59
16
17 EXHIBITS
18 A. Highland Woods Rezone Finding of Fact
19 B. Memorandum from Katrina Knutson re: Draft Illahee Plan & Related Documents
20 C. Draft Illahee Community Plan
21 D. Illahee Citizen Advisory Group Meeting Summaries
22 E. Illahee Public Comment
23 F. Illahee Community Plan Staff Report
24 G. Memorandum from Angie Silva re: Silverdale Sub-Area Plan Amendments: Waaga
25 Way Connector Roads
26 H. Proposed Waaga Way Process Schedule
27 I. Proposed Amendments to the Silverdale Sub-Area Plan
28 J. Waaga Way Connector Road Alignment Alternatives & Resource Maps
29
30 MINUTES approved this _______ day of _______ 2008.
31
32 _______________________________________
33 Fred Depee, Planning Commission Chair
34
35 _______________________________________
36 Amanda Walston, Planning Commission Secretary
37