Kitsap County Planning Commission – April 13, 2004

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
April 13, 2004


1. Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order and made introductions

2. Approval of Minutes

March 9, 2004

A motion was made by Commissioner Coppola and seconded by Commissioner Mahan that the minutes of March 9, 2004 be approved. The Vote: 7-Aye; 0-Opposed; 1-Abstained. Motion carried.

March 23, 2004

A motion was made by Commissioner Coppola and seconded by Commissioner Taylor that the minutes of March 23, 2004 be approved subjected to textual changes submitted by Commissioner Mark Flynn. The Vote: 6-Aye; 0-Opposed; 2-Abstained. Motion carried.
3. Committee Reports

Lary Coppola attended the joint meeting between the City of Port Orchard and the Board of County Commissioners Monday, April 12, 2004. The meeting was on updated Port Orchard/South Kitsap planning process.

John Ahl requested comments on draft roles and responsibilities.

John Taylor has comments prepared to submit.

4. Old Business

Continuation of discussion on SKIA criterion for land use processes

Eric Baker - Displayed a map of SKIA, noting this matter was a topic of discussion at a Planning Commission work/study session two months ago. The issue is land use options beyond Master Planning. In review, the SKIA Subarea Plan adopted in December of 2003, established a Master Planning requirement for the subarea. Industrial and business center properties in this area had to develop a Master Plan based on sub-basins where the development is located. This meant that instead of just preparing a plan for a specific property or areas near that property, a developer would need to incorporate the entire sub-basin. They would need to address issues such as economic development goals. Prior to development of the SKIA plan, industrial areas existed as well as some industrial development, predominantly located in the Port Of Bremerton, near the Olympic View Industrial Park and Bremerton National Airport. Staff believed that although Master Planning was an excellent approach for SKIA as a whole, there should also be other options for already developed areas with sewer and water. The Subarea Plan delineates two options: 1) Lands ready for development addresses properties with utilities in the area and will therefore bypass any future land use needs, going directly to building permit and site development activity permit; and 2) Industrial Park requires properties to plan in 20-acre increments laying out all infrastructure, stormwater and critical area protections, etc. for an industrial park. Previous criteria based on a series of radiuses from existing infrastructure. The map was used to identify existing infrastructure. Previous set of draft criteria presented to the Planning
Commission on Ready for Development showed the need to meet all criteria, for instance infrastructure needed to be within 200 feet. New criteria change this to the need to meet 4 out of 6 of the expanded criteria. On the handout today, the six criteria were reviewed and discussed. (See Draft SKIA Criteria for Determination of Land Use Process Kitsap County Department of Community Development, dated March 25, 2004).

After Baker clarified criteria No. 6 regarding the site not being significantly constrained by critical areas, Mike Gustavson suggested the wording be clarified to read “50%” instead of “significantly constrained. . .”

Baker– Once criteria is established and adopted by the Board of County Commissioners, the Port and any other properties within the SKIA boundaries, can submit a type 1 application for an administrative decision requesting that the property be considered Ready for Development. Following a positive decision, the property will be designated as such on the County’s land use map for everyone to see the designation is different than the remainder of properties in SKIA. The Port’s concern regarding the 200-foot radius for sewer and water utilities in conditions 1 and 2, is that it this could create un-buildable false pockets. These would not be left out of the buildable portion. The language following the 6 criteria, giving the Director discretion is intended to deal with such pockets. The other option, as mentioned, is Industrial Parks that must be done is 20-acre increments. Staff will be looking at any pockets of land less than 20 acres in size. The key to the criteria is for the landowner needs to show why each parcel is different from the others. Master Planning is critical to SKIA’s success. It distinguishes other areas nearby such as Rural Wooded from SKIA lands. Industrial Park would be appropriate on any property within 1500 feet of either Barney-White Road or State Hwy 3.

Dean Jenniges–Restricting to 1500 feet, might create pockets on the other side. He asked Baker if entire area is not ready for development without infrastructure?

Baker – It is augmenting existing land use process, or Master Planning. Staff wanted to add Industrial Park and Ready for Development to existing properties where infrastructure already exists. To add another land use option to the process could detract from developability.
Lary Coppola – If a 1500 foot strip is developed, it means infrastructure must already be in place. Once the infrastructure is in place, does the 200-foot requirement come into play?

Baker– The Ready for Development is a one-time option intended to be utilized in the first year of SKIA development. Therefore it would not create a “creep” affect in the area.

John Ahl – Relative to meeting 4 out of 6 of the listed criteria making property “Ready for Development”, it is difficult to conceive a site qualifying as developable if criteria 1 and 2 requiring sewer and water, are not met. Some criteria are more important than others and suggested these two criteria not be made optional. For Industrial Park qualification, if the 1500 feet boundary is diagonal through the north and south grid, possibly allowing a portion of property not designated “Ready for Development,” will it be pulled into that classification?

Baker – The Department has the flexibility to determine how to make the call based on a common sense approach.

John Taylor – Asked for clarification on water and sewer requirements.

Baker – Water and sewer are definite, (must have) issues. Moving throughout the development, infrastructure starts and stops; stormwater only goes so far. Because of the checkerboard pattern created, SKIA shows various degrees of infrastructure. Yes, properties can be considered ready for development without infrastructure. The decision can be decided through permit review.

Taylor – Asked if industrial parks on Bond Road are on septic and is it not true that several areas in Kitsap County are designated “Industrial” yet are not even close to sewers, Sees this as government usually waiting until land owner decides to develop property, at which point they are then required to pay for the infrastructure. Thinks this is backwards to the GMA that states government is to supply and fund infrastructure ahead of time.

Baker– This concept has been discussed in Kitsap County for twenty years. He showed an existing lagoon area on that map that is owned by the Port and can serve most of the Port property. The cost to run sewer from McCormick Woods to the Port’s lagoon is approximately $7.5 million plus an additional $6+ million to extend the trunk line to the lower portion
of SKIA. That is roughly $14 million dollars of public investment that does not include hook-ups running off the main trunk line. It is correct that soliciting industrial businesses to the area would be easier with the entire infrastructure in place.

Taylor – Price you pay for economic development.

Jenniges—Against requiring sewer hookups when in some instances, septic fields would be adequate. To require sewer systems will stop growth. Most businesses only need toilets for employees. Why require sewer hook-ups?

Baker – Goal for the Kitsap County Comp Plan is to move toward business park type settings. True, some business park and manufacturing uses will have greater need than others for sewers. However, the more septic systems installed, the less likely sewers will be extended to that area and the less likely developers will be able to absorb the cost of such amenities in order to develop their land.

Jenniges—Asked if it might depend on the type sewer systems and Baker referenced examples of more intense types of industrial uses such as companies needing to wash large equipment. He also asked if septic vs. sewers will make Kitsap County competitive.

Baker– Economic development in Kitsap County is about competition between jurisdictions. SKIA needs to be made as attractive and successful as possible to potential developers and the EDC reports that developers want sewers. If consideration is given to maximize the development potential of the South Kitsap Industrial Area, then sewers take up far less landmass than septic systems.

Jenniges – Not against the plan, only against the cost.

Mike Gustavson – Supports the dollar figures needed and asked if Kitsap County wants to have more jobs available. If so, development of areas such as SKIA needs to be an easy process. Referenced two issues in SKIA at the airport. One is that the Port of Bremerton, is a stand-alone business itself. The other is that the Port leases out properties that creates additional revenue for the Port. He also questioned why sewers were necessary. Point collection option was discussed as an alternative to sewers and suggested writing criteria to address handling waste products.
to be more productive than stating sewers are required. It might be possible to keep waste products on an individual parcel and develop without sewers. This is far less costly and damaging to the property and the properties might be developed sooner to create jobs.

Baker – Clarified that Gustavson is suggesting that the Port would have the ability to opt out of sewers.

Gustavson – If a developer can manage his waste stream through alternative processes, it should be considered.

Mark Flynn – With a large area set aside for Industrial and Business Park development and the creation of certain types of avenues to get to expediting development, why not allow an amended process providing closeness to services after something has been developed in the 1500 foot corridor. Need to consider expediting process where regulations are already in place.

Baker – This is the Master Planning process, coordinating and thus avoiding duplication of infrastructure. Staff is looking at other options because there exist developed areas that Master Planning, while an excellent tool for coordinating infrastructure, might not always be the best approach. Ideally, Master Planning for 3,400 acres would have been best but is also cost prohibitive.

M. Flynn– If development proceeds in the 1500-foot corridor, is there some way for staff to work with developers to utilize services that are close in proximity.

Laura Ditmer– Asked if this issue could be addressed later specifically on sewer discussions held last year.

Baker – Although it is helpful to try and factor this discussion into the document presented today, certainly more information regarding septic vs. sewers can be brought back to the Commission at a future date for consideration. With respect to Mark Flynn’s question about post development of the 1500-foot corridor, should not there be an easier mechanism for possibly the next 500 feet? Existing development is acknowledged after which Master Planning is the avenue. Since Master Planning gives the best coordination, best ability to bring in a variety of tenants with pre-planning already provided, staff prefers Master Planning
to any other option. Once Master Plan is completed, the developer goes straight to building and site development permits. This is an expedited process. The SKIA Subarea Plan itself promotes Master Planning.

Monty Mahan – Asked about the status of timeline relative to the following statement in Baker’s March 29, 2004 memo, “The development use required must occur within six months of the plan’s adoption.

Baker – Today was intended to be a public hearing on this issue but was instead advertised as a work-study session. There is some flexibility on completion of this item since the timeline is aggressive.

Ken Attebery, Port of Bremerton – When asked by Commissioner Mahan the Port’s thoughts on delaying the process, Attebery responded that the Port wants to work the issue until everyone is comfortable with the outcome. As it now stands, the Port has had the “Ready for Development” in place for all Port properties since 1998. The SKIA process superceded this. As long as the Ready for Development status remains in place as it has been for the past 5 years as it goes through more review, there is no objection to a continuing refinement of the issues. The Port is down to one issue and is ready to move forward to public hearing.

Chair Nevins clarified for the audience that the Agricultural/Equestrian Code amendment public hearing is scheduled for April 27, 7 PM, at the Presidents Hall.

Gustavson – Observation: the more tax base the easier it is to come in later with infrastructure. Need to do everything possible to encourage development. Often infrastructure comes after much development has taken place. Important to get businesses in place first then go back and address infrastructure. Thinks Port should do its complete design layout prior to development.

Baker – Infrastructure is cheaper the more developed property is in place. Need to assure future development is not cut due to lack of sewers.

Gustavson – Asked for clarification of trunk line layout.

Baker– The layout is in the SKIA Subarea Plan.
Coppola – In planning for infrastructure, has any thought been given to creating a timeline relative to issuance of a building permit with the caveat that when a certain amount of development takes place, the developers will need to fund infrastructure?

Baker – Currently have something similar with respect to Business Center lands. Concern is creating defacto moratorium due to it being cost prohibitive for developers to pay the cost of post development upgrades. McCormick Woods the closest sewer line to SKIA with the capacity to serve all of SKIA. There is also additional capacity build in for future development.

Coppola – Asked about additional capacity as it relates to the County’s issue of sewering Gorst.

Baker – Two sewer options were considered during development of the SKIA Plan; Port Orchard and Bremerton, which is the most cost effective option.

Discussion continued between Baker and the Planning Commission regarding costs and proximity to existing sewer lines.

Chair Nevins – Noted original SKIA Plan discussion contained much information on the sewer issue.

Monty – Commented that in general, retrofitting public infrastructure is far more expensive that installing pre-construction

Taylor – Most businesses will not buy into retrofitting.

Baker – Subaru dealership in Gorst is good example of the retrofitting issue following a failing septic system.

Jenniges – Gave example of homes having always been on septic tanks with drainfields. Eventually sewers were installed with the homeowner’s knowledge in advance that they would be required to hook-up to sewers. Same process should be used with Industrial Park areas like SKIA. Developers should be allowed to begin construction with the knowledge that eventually they will be required to hook up to sewers. He recommended the developer agree to this and sign an agreement.
Baker – Kitsap County’s position is the fear of putting businesses out of business because of sewer requirements.

Jenniges – The agreement suggested would state that when critical mass is reach, hook-up is required. No alternative unless the County is willing to fund $17 million.

Coppola and John Ahl - $17 million not a lot considering the return on the investment. Both believed there would be citizen support for this to bring jobs to Kitsap County. Could be funded by a bond issue.

Attebery – Did not think any other properties in SKIA would be involved in this except Port property. Gave goals of the Port and displayed an aerial map showing the Port’s properties.

The SKIA map was discussed and clarification was made on some markings on the map.

Taylor – Was told the Bremerton Raceway track would be relocated to the south of SKIA near the Mason County line. As the airport expands, racing will not be a compatible activity.

Attebery - The small area at the northern tip of the SKIA is part of the Port’s request because part of the existing runway and some areas cannot be developed because of FAA regulations. The Port is looking for every advantage possible to provide jobs for Kitsap residents.

Baker – Wants additional time to discuss further at public hearing on May 11, 2004.

Review changes to the draft ordinance and potential amendments to the County Code addressing regulations for Agriculture and Equestrian activities (in preparation for April 27, 2004 public hearing) – Eric Baker

Eric Baker, DCD staff, distributed and reviewed a document dated March 27, 2004 titled Draft Agricultural and Equestrian Regulation Revisions. At a previous Planning Commission work/study session, several issues of concern were addressed. As a result, changes to the draft document have been made to: 17.432.020 Animal Densities – deleting the words “less than five (5) acres in size. . .”, changing number of poultry from 12 to
24 on both the first 1 ½ acres and each additional acre and changing
footnote 1 to read, “Livestock quantities may be modified with an approved
Farm Plan. Such a Farm Plan would then dictate the number of livestock,
ratites, small animals and/or poultry allowed on the property.” The last
paragraph of this section was modified to read, “. . .implemented Farm
Plan. . .” and the words Conservation District Farm Plan are deleted.
Section 17.432.030 – Setbacks, The following words are added to the first
paragraph, “Setbacks for confinement areas and manure storage areas
may be modified with an approved and implemented Farm Plan. Same
section, third paragraph under B., Farm Plan is inserted in place of
“Conservation Farm Plan” that is deleted. Same change under D., fourth
paragraph. Same change, Section 17.432.050 – Equestrian Impact
Activity, 3.d.

Baker - Carla Pizzano, Conservation District, provided a table of
phosphorus and nitrogen breakdown. Gave example of effects of waste
materials from different types of species, i.e., 1000 lb. horse same as
chickens. Chickens produce more nitrogen and phosphorus. Factoring
these elements, 36 chickens can produce as much nitrogen as a 1000 lb.
Horse. As a result of this study, the poultry number was changed as
stated earlier from 12 to 24. As phosphorus is become more and more the
contaminant of note, 24 was selected over 36. The number is based on
BAS.

Jenniges – Does not have much faith in BAS and thinks the tables should
be removed. Requirements are already in place for handling manure.

Mahan – What about run-off?

Jenniges – Run-off is covered by setbacks. Also thinks proposed
restrictions in the tables are unfair to the average citizen who just wants to
own a few animals.

Gustavson– Tables are included as a basic structure to use for reference.
Every parcel is unique. If a person wishes to increase the animal density
on their property, then the Farm Plan comes into play. The tables merely
provide a starting point.

Coppola– Agreed that the tables are a starting point and that if a Farm
Plan is developed, use of the property can vary from there.
Baker – Does not understand people’s general fear of the Farm Plan since it can maximize the use of one’s property. Another benefit is eligibility for federal dollars to make property enhancements. There are so many positives.

Coppola – People are more nervous about government intrusion into their lives and control over their private property.

Pizzano – The Conservation District is not a government entity.

Jenniges – Understands that some manage their land better than others and sees the need for a starting point. However believes that the starting point now is adherence to the tables when contaminates and confinement should be the main issues.

Baker– Told Planning Commission that Kitsap County Code Enforcement oversees the regulations and the Conservation District manages the Farm Plan.

Taylor – Asked how landowners feel at this point about the pending amended regulations. Reminded staff and the Commission that the last public hearing on this matter was heavily attended.

Baker – Still some apprehension about changes to the regulations. He referenced the citizens committee made up of half agricultural and half equestrian landowners. Ample time was provided for citizens other than committee members to testify. A number of changes were made based on comments from public other than committee members. Also held two open houses to disseminate information to the public and answer any questions or concerns. Comments were received at the open houses on this issue of criteria for owning less or more than five-acres. Kitsap County has never had regulations for more than five acres of land. The item before the Planning Commission is to amend existing regulations, not create new ones.

Gustavson – Would like to see the acreage limit issue addressed again at the public hearing.

Chair Nevins - Asked for level of concern or agreement to what Commissioner Gustavson is proposing.
A motion was made by Commissioner Gustavson that the tables and text be revised to show quantities reflected on first one acre and each additional ½ acre as opposed to the printed text.

Mahan – Clarified that each five-acre parcel could hold 9 horses.

Baker – Suggested that there is only two weeks until the public hearing and since the current draft reviewed today is already posted on the County’s web page, any additional changes could create confusion at the upcoming public hearing. He requested that any changes to the current draft be made at the April 27, 2004 public hearing.

Gustavson – Asked for a discussion among the Planning Commission members about his motion made above on line 1.

Chair Nevins – The numbers have been derived from criteria by staff more informed than he is and suggested that they be left as is on the draft until the public hearing.

Gustavson – Thought Pizzano should explain criteria used to determine the acreage numbers.

Cindy Baker – Asked for clarification about Farm Plan agreement and learned that most members present were in favor except Jenniges and Taylor. She then asked how many agreed with the tables as written in the current draft. At least four members wanted to address the tables at the public hearing. Some time ago, Baker said she worked for the Conservation District and knows Farm Plans can work. She emphasized that regulations such as these are created for those citizens unwilling to properly manage animals on their land. The County is trying to decide on a good balance.

Jenniges – At public hearing he felt that people were uncertain about what animals they could have on their property unless they had a Farm Plan yet the process for implementing a Farm Plan is lengthy. Some even said they preferred to move to another county to avoid this regulation. Without the density tables, he likes the document presented today.

C. Baker – Appreciated comments and needs to get clear understanding on the issues of concern since she has not previously been involved in this process.
Monty – The table needs to be included in the document. He is amenable to re-working the density numbers that may be overly restrictive. Other consultants besides the Conservation District are capable of doing this. The threat to move to another county might also be out of fear because that particular property owner is not currently managing their land properly. A point to reiterate is that the proposed changes are to an already existing ordinance, not the creation of entirely new regulations. He asked E. Baker to briefly delineate the differences between the existing ordinance and the proposed changes.

E. Baker – Currently regulations allow two animal units per acre. This is viewed as middle point between good and poor land stewards. Current regulations do not acknowledge a Farm Plan as an option. Many residents do have a Plan however. Setbacks, a feeding area (old definition of confinement area, less than 20,000 square feet in size) must be 100 feet from adjacent properties. New regulations call for riding arenas and commercial stables collecting money for services, to have a Conditional Use Permit. The only area that could be seen as more restrictive is the animal density section. Again, two per acre is based on an average. Because of the Farm Plan flexibility, the number allowed could change based on the respective plan. The newly proposed changes are similar to other jurisdictions, for instance King County is similar yet more restrictive. A note: the County does have major problem areas with poultry violations.

Laura Ditmer – Asked if the Conservation District provides a handout for the public to review, and was informed by E. Baker that there is information on the District’s website, handouts were provided at the last public hearing, at Committee meetings and open houses. The Conservation District does site specific analysis.

There was no second to Commissioner Gustavson’s motion and the motion was withdrawn until the April 27, 2004 public hearing.

Jenniges – Believes the animal density issue is too controversial. Need to concentrate on other issues such as stream setbacks. He presented examples from a stream in California’s Napa Valley that is given consideration on class and size. He questioned why Kitsap does not use this type of criteria and why there is a difference between states.
E. Baker – There are different standards for streams between states. This
is further addressed the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO).

Chair Nevins – Clarified that the Planning Commission is ready to hear
additional public comment on April 27, 2004.

Other Items – Chair Nevins

1. Is a majority of five votes is needed for non Comp Plan related
   issues? Checked the GMA that five votes are needed to
   recommend changes to the Comp Plan. Did not find any language
   addressing issues outside of the Comp Plan process. Thinks this
   should be addressed in Rules of Procedure that the Planning
   Commission is currently in the process of amending. Rules of
   Procedure may be amended if it is discussed at one meeting and
   voted on at the next. Asked the Planning Commission members to
   discuss preference on number of votes required for issues other
   than Comp Plan related. The outcome of the discussion can then be
   voted on at the next regular meeting, May 11, 2004.

Discussion:

Coppola – In favor of simple majority for non-Comprehensive Plan items.

Ahl – Zoning Code amendments should be held to same requirement as
the Comp Plan related issues, five votes. If something is written up as law,
then procedures need to be amended to reflect the voting requirements.
The Board of County Commissioners heavily considers the Planning
Commission’s recommendations.

Chair Nevins – Clarified Ahl’s comments to reflect that any land use
change require five votes. However Open Space applications should only
require a simple majority vote.

Coppola – Sees potential problem if full Planning Commission is not
present. Could delay a process by requiring five votes.

Jenniges – Believes it is incumbent on Planning Commission members to
be present if at all possible.
The motion to say land use changes will require five votes will be acted on at May 11, 2004 Planning Commission meeting.

2. Need for clarification on issue of when to hold joint meetings with the Board of County Commissioners. Is it only Comp Plan related issues or other public hearings such as the one coming up on April 27 and discussed today relative to Agricultural/Equestrian regulations. Chair Nevins sent email to the Board. Responses ranged from agreement to let Planning Commission conduct its own business to what the Planning Commission interpreted from last joint meeting to can go either way.

Taylor – Understood the intent was to expedite the public comment process and everyone’s time by holding joint hearings on all matters.

Coppola – Understood same as Taylor.

Jenniges – Should hold joint meetings on specific subjects only.

Ahl – Issue still remains that the Board wants to hear Planning Commission’s pleasure. Thinks it becomes more essential in the final analysis of the Comp Plan Amendment Process that the Board of County Commissioners and the Planning Commission jointly hear the same information and public comments. Does not think it is necessary to hold a joint session on every public hearing item.

Gustavson - Reason for joint hearing is to have complete information. There is the problem that citizens tend to bypass the Planning Commission hearings but attend the Board of County Commissioners hearings, thereby not getting complete information. Agrees that on significant issues, hearings should be held jointly.

Jenniges – Understood that a joint hearing was to be scheduled the first part of June. This would be based on commissioner priorities and specific subjects related to GMA planning issues.

Planning Commission in agreement that joint hearings should be held on Comp Plan related items and other major issues.

Chair Nevins – Question remains on how to decide if an issue is major and how to schedule this in advance.
Gustavson – Potential problem is that holding a joint meeting with the Board of County Commissioners precludes Planning Commission members from speaking individually as private citizens in front of the Board.

Ditmer – Was the matter of Planning Commission members testifying personally discussed at the December 2003 retreat? She will check with legal staff on this subject*.

Regarding the legal question of holding joint hearings, Chair Nevins said there does not appear to be any provisions in the law precluding this activity.

Mark Flynn – Cautioned that when using word “flexibility” that it not be interpreted as “inconsistent.” Suggested the need to state specifically when something will or will not occur.

Ahl – Recognized potential problem if Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners hold separate public hearings to consider information for the Planning Commission to form recommendations and the Board of County Commissioners to form decisions. Where does the linkage between the recommendation and decision (that the Board may have already made at the joint hearing) occur?

Chair Nevins – Operation in the joint hearing process, will be a joint hearing on Comp Plan amendments then the Planning Commission will hold another meeting to discuss recommendation and findings, which will then be forwarded to the Board. The Board will then consider no further public testimony but will make its decision based on previous testimony at the joint hearing, its deliberations and on the Planning Commission’s findings.

Gustavson – Previous discussion was held relative to a Planning Commission member sitting with the Board to answer any questions the Commissioners might have.

The Commission members discussed the issue of also having a minority opinion and the Planning Commission’s Findings of Fact. It was concluded in a recent meeting that an individual Planning Commissioner could submit a minority opinion to be attached to the Findings. Also that
that the Planning Commissioner(s), not staff, write the minority opinion. Proper formatting of Findings is needed.

Chair Nevins – Take back to the Board of County Commissioners that the Planning Commission wants Comp Plan joint meetings. Specific areas of Comprehensive Plan amendments were discussed, such as site specifics and subareas.

Chair Nevins – For 2004, Comp Plan amendments will be joint meetings, and then evaluated at the end of the year.

Ahl – Suggested someone write up post meeting procedures, including preparing recommendations. Also, need to address who chairs the joint meeting. It was noted that historically it is the Chair of the Board of County Commissioners.

3. Sub-Committee - Chair Nevins, Michael Gustavson and John Taylor will work on joint meetings rules.

4. At the previous Planning Commission meeting, Jenniges mentioned a handout he received when appointed. He received it from Jan Koske, Kitsap County’s Volunteer Coordinator and Chair Nevins now has it to share with entire Commission. It addressed procedures expected of Planning Commission members.

5. Some members questioned the upcoming meeting section at the bottom of each agenda. It was determined that the Planning Commission members requested this section be added at a previous meeting in 2003. Members still want to see this section on upcoming agendas.

6. John Taylor will be unavailable April 26 and 27, and will not be attending the April 27, 2004 Planning Commission public hearing.

5. **New Business**

6. **Other Business**

Monty Mahan left at 11:00 AM.
7. At 11:20 AM, no other business being heard, a motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Dean Jenniges that the meeting be adjourned. The Vote: Aye-7; Against-0. Motion carried.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A. Draft Agenda for Tuesday, April 13, 2004 Planning Commission Work Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Revised Notice of Planning Commission Work Study Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Draft SKIA Criteria for Determination of Land Use Process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Letter from the Port of Bremerton to Kitsap County Planning Commission dated April 13, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Draft Agricultural and Equestrian Regulation Revisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Volunteer Job Description dated September 23, 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Sign-in Sheet for April 13, 2004 Planning Commission Work Study session</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MINUTES approved this ________________ day of __________________, 2004.

________________________________________
Tom Nevins, Chair

________________________________________
Planning Commission Secretary