

MINUTES

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING August 2, 2005

The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Island Lake Community Center, 1099 NW Island Lake Road, Poulsbo, Washington 98370. Members Present: Tom Nevins, Monty Mahan, Lary Coppola, John Taylor, Frank Mahaffay Dean Jenniges, Mike Gustavson and John Ahl. Staff Present: Cindy Baker, Scott Diener, Angie Silva, Shelley Kneip and Acting Planning Commission Secretary Brynan Pierce. 15 citizens from the public were in attendance.

9:00 AM

- A. Chair Monty Mahan called the meeting to order and introduced the Planning Commission members present.

9:05 A.M.

Approval of Minutes

B. June 28, 2005 Minutes

- Michael Gustavson – Page 23, line 35, replace word thing with think.
- Lary Coppola – Reminded staff that he previously requested the dollar figure for land that would become unusable if the Critical Areas Ordinance second draft is enacted but does not see it in the minutes.
- Chair Mahan – suggested these minutes be tabled until the next meeting. Mahan reiterated Coppola's request directly to Cindy Baker, the Director of the Department of Community

1 Development. He asked Coppola to email his request directly
2 to Holly Anderson, Planning Commission Secretary.
3

4 **B. Work/Study**
5

6 Special work/study session to present the Planning Commission with an
7 information briefing based on changes to the Interim Rural Forest/Rural
8 Wooded Comprehensive Plan Amendments enacted in 2003. The Board
9 of County Commissioners intends to take legislative action on this matter
10 in response to an order of the Central Puget Sound Growth Management
11 Hearings Board (CPSGMHB), on August 8, 2005 at its regularly scheduled
12 public hearing, 10 AM at the Kitsap County courthouse in the Board's
13 Chambers, 614 Division St, Room 104, Port Orchard, WA 98366. The
14 CPSGMHB has ordered Kitsap County to take legislative action by August
15 9, 2005.
16

17 Shelley Kneip, Chief Deputy Prosecuting Attorney – Presented an
18 ordinance repealing the ordinance passed in 2003 on Rural Wooded
19 Comprehensive Plan policies. In 2003, there exists a long history with this
20 portion of the Comp Plan. There was a long-standing definition for Interim
21 Rural Forest. This was problematic in that it addressed what was called
22 rural forest lands that were not necessarily rural in nature. In 2003, the
23 County adopted some Comprehensive Plan policy changes allowing for a
24 clustering program with a base density of one residential unit per 20 acres
25 but by clustering, one unit per 5 acres was allowed. There were, however,
26 no development regulations adopted associated with clustering to
27 implement the program. It was the County's intent to proceed with work
28 on such regulations in the next year. The policies were subsequently
29 appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) by a
30 number of appellants. The GMHB found in favor of the appellants and that
31 the policies were not in compliance with the Growth Management Act
32 (GMA). On August 9, 2004, the GMHB gave the County one year to get
33 the policies in order. Meanwhile, other appeals have been filed with the
34 GMHB and ruling that the County was to have completed its ten year
35 Comprehensive Plan review by December 1, 2004. This is a different
36 reading of the statute than staff had. This situation has shifting much of
37 the planning activities in that the ten-year Plan review will take up much
38 staff time. Since the County must take some type of legislative action to
39 deal with the Comp Plan policies by August 9, 2005, the only feasible thing
40 to do was to have the Board of County Commissioners repeal the policies
41 found to be non-compliant and to re-instate what was previously in the

1 Comprehensive Plan. This is planned to take place at the Board's August
2 8, 2005 public hearing.

- 3
- 4 • Coppola – Asked for clarification in that the policies were found to be
5 out of compliance a year ago with a year to get into compliance, but
6 nothing was done until recently and now the policies are back to
7 what they were prior to what they were before.

8

9 Kneip – This is partially correct but it is not correct to say that nothing was
10 done. Staff was working on the policies and the order came out on August
11 9, 2004. On September 17, 2004 the GMHB issued another order on
12 reconsideration and at that time the requirement of the ten year review
13 was brought up. This has been appealed by the County in Thurston
14 County. This was followed by the 2004 amendments were also being
15 appealed in which case a Failure to Act claim filed because December 1
16 of 2004 had passed with no completion of the ten-year review by the
17 County. In June of 2005, the GMHB issued another order that the County
18 was not in compliance. The ten-year review comes with some automatic
19 sanctions that will be problematic to the County in relation to grant funding.

- 20
- 21 • Coppola – Did not really answer the question he asked.

22

23 Kneip – Coppola did not ask a question but instead stated that the County
24 did nothing for a year and are now repealing the policies for Rural Wooded
25 clustering.

- 26
- 27 • Coppola – Thinks he heard Kneip say that the County is going back
28 to the ordinance previously enacted before the current one was
29 appealed.

30

31 Kneip – This is correct. The County is going back to the Comprehensive
32 Plan policies.

- 33
- 34 • Coppola – Reiterated that the ordinance in the beginning was out of
35 compliance, the ordinance passed was not in compliance and now
36 going back to the original was not in compliance.

37

38 Kneip – The original was in compliance. The County is going back to the
39 original Comp Plan policies.

40

- 1 • Coppola – If it was originally in compliance, why try to change it at
2 all?
3

4 Kneip – Again, Kneip explained that the policies in the Comprehensive
5 Plan, page 7, section 3 of the ordinance, states that the County will
6 consider a clustering program. It sets out perimeters that will be used.
7 These are what staff intends to work on. These were found to be in
8 compliance in 1998. When these were adjusted to set up the clustering
9 program, the GMHB found these to be out of compliance due to being too
10 vague, open ended and there were no development regulations
11 associated with the program.

- 12
13 • Coppola – Clarified that the County is going back to what was in
14 place prior to the most recent ordinance and buying some time to
15 complete the ten-year review.
16

17 Kneip – The intention is that once the ten-year review and the UGA review
18 countywide is completed, these policies will be revisited.
19

- 20 • Mike Gustavson – Asked for more clarification on a GMHB appeal.
21 First asked if that board provides specific comments on individual
22 appeals for the County's review.
23

24 Kneip – That board provides guidance and does not get too specific. She
25 showed the Planning Commission members a packet containing a
26 decision on the 2003 case and the ordinance. The GMHB's decision
27 references some ambiguities in standards and the vagueness but did felt it
28 was not in compliance because of the development regulations. The
29 Board of County Commissioners was to have made some Findings of Fact
30 and Conclusions of Law on an Innovative Rural Program, which was not
31 done. While they made their decision based on a technicality, one Board
32 member, McGuire, got very specific on the quantitative dimensions of the
33 clustering program. He said the County did not have any outer limits on
34 how large the clusters could be.
35

- 36 • Gustavson – Asked if this will make it easier to do the second time.
37

38 Kneip – While more guidance is given for the second time, there is a
39 complicating factor on the other decisions such as the reasonable
40 measures and the ten-year review. The GMHB held that the County's
41 available lands report showed an inconsistency as to what is happening in

1 the rural areas vs. the urban areas. It also shows the same amount of
2 development in both areas. This will make it somewhat harder to promote
3 a clustering program and increased density in the rural areas.

- 4
- 5 • Frank Mahaffay – Noted that in the ordinance it states that “certain
6 policies” were not in compliance with the GMA and asked why the
7 Planning Commission has not received the specific policies sited.
8 Are there certain policies that need to be changed?
9

10 Kneip – There are certain policies that need to be changed. The order
11 states, the Board concluded that the County did not show the Rural
12 Wooded Land policies. The Board specifically called out RWL policies 10a
13 and 10b, and RL 11a through i. These are listed in section 2 and section 3
14 of the ordinance. These are the policies adopted in the 2003 Comp Plan
15 Amendments. Mentioned that in 2003 most members present were on the
16 Planning Commission at time of adoption, but the policies were not
17 recommended by the Planning Commission to be adopted by the Board of
18 County Commissioners. She listed the entire 2003 list of amendments
19 that was a huge packet. The Rural Wooded issue became unclear at the
20 end and some quick fixes were implemented. The Planning Commission
21 recommended that it be tabled to give time for a completed document.
22

- 23 • Dean Jenniges – Had several questions. First regarding prior
24 ownership. The draft presented today states that 50% of the
25 property set aside and put in reserve is designated permanently
26 undevelopable and placed on a permanent track. Thinks this says a
27 person will automatically lose 50% of their property.
28

29 Kneip – This is part of the policies that are being appealed. It was set up
30 as an optional program by using Density Bonus. To have one resident per
31 5 acres rather than one resident per 20 acres, the 50% set-aside is part of
32 the trade off. However, it wasn't clear in the policies how long it was to be
33 kept in reserve. She listed several options for using the Density Bonus
34 option.
35

- 36 • Jenniges – Concern is that the document in total reflects that the
37 County has re-designated rural. Previously a Rural designation
38 allowed for one home per 2 ½ acres. He thinks it was zoned Rural
39 Forest. The re-designation has limited a person from being able to
40 develop their property to the maximum previously allowed thus
41 negating the investment value. Ahl person can no longer put their

1 home in the middle of their property due to the clustering provision.
2 Also the 5,000 square foot impervious surface aspect limits land
3 usage. Asked how the County can arbitrarily make these changes
4 that impact people's life's so significantly. Questioned
5 compensation.

6

7 Kneip – First, pre-GMA, the lowest density lot allowance was 2 ½ acres.
8 The Growth Board ruled that Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan was
9 invalid because of this density in the rural areas. It is not the County
10 arbitrarily making this decision; it has been ordered to decrease the
11 density in the rural areas. As to clustering being forced on a person, this is
12 not the case. It is a voluntary program that many of the large landowners
13 wanted in order to develop their land more effectively.

14

- 15 • Jenniges – Asked what is rural about 50 homes clustered in one
16 area.

17

18 Kneip – Part of the criteria that would have come from the development
19 regulations was that clustered be done in such as manner as to retain the
20 rural character. This was not spelled out fully. The opponents argued this
21 point.

22

- 23 • Jenniges – Referenced Lake Symington and a “cancerous” affect in
24 this rural area because of current zoning regulations. Needs to
25 understand the need for this change in the rural character of Kitsap
26 County.

27

- 28 • Chair Mahan – Did not think Kneip was disagreeing with Jenniges on
29 that point.

30

31 Kneip – The change is being made because Kitsap County is under a
32 GMHB order to make the change. The policies being repealed are ones
33 Jenniges apparently does not agree with anyway.

34

- 35 • John Ahl – He understands that this briefing today is for
36 informational purposes only and that the Planning Commission is not
37 being asked to study the issue, make a recommendation and hold a
38 public hearing on the matter. Further, that this is being done, the
39 Planning Commission is being advised of this and therefore input is
40 not required.

41

1 • Jenniges – Asked why then is the item called a work/study issue.

2

3 • Chair Mahan – Reiterated that the Planning Commission either holds
4 a work/study or a public hearing.

5

6 Kneip – It is important to have the Planning Commission involved because
7 eventually, it will come back before them.

8

9 • Ahl – Questioned how the Planning Commission would be involved.

10

11 • Chair Mahan – To respect everyone’s valuable time, he suggested
12 that the Planning Commission members should ask brief questions
13 to clarify what is happening with the original ordinance and the
14 Hearings Board decision, followed by a more in-depth discussion if
15 needed by Planning Commission members without Kneip present.

16

17 • Mahaffay – Asked if there is an appeal process for orders levied
18 against the County by the GMHB. He referenced the rationale of
19 being out of compliance with more development in rural than urban
20 areas. He is not a supporter of social engineering on which this
21 order appears to be based. People will not go to the County and
22 find out where the County wants them to live, they will go where they
23 want to live. If there is an appeal process in place and has the
24 County utilized this and if not, why not.

25

26 Kneip – The County did appeal the Rural Wooded issue, the Reasonable
27 Measures and the Ten-year Review issue. However, appearance before
28 the GMHB is almost an annual event. On the last case before that board,
29 there were 3 main issues dealt with: 1) George’s Corner, 1) Whether or
30 not the County had adopted Reasonable Measures, and 3)

31

32 • Mahaffay – Interrupted to repeat his question of did the County
33 appeal the rural zoning issue and if not, why not.

34

35 Kneip – It was a Board of County Commissioners decision. It was felt that
36 an appeal of this issue would not be successful and it would be better to
37 concentrate on other more difficult portions of the decision. In fact the
38 GMHB did not explicitly state the reason they did not like the Rural
39 Wooded was because there was more development in the rural areas.
40 The 66-page decision states that Kitsap County has inconsistencies in
41 rural development more than in urban areas. In other words, the decision

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 2, 2005

1 did not state whether or not the Rural Wooded policies were in
2 compliance. Kitsap County had 25 separate issues. Each issue is
3 addressed separately, but under the Rural Wooded issue, the GMHB does
4 not specifically state that you can't do this because of what's happening in
5 the rural areas. When they addressed the Reasonable Measures issue, it
6 states that Kitsap County is out of compliance because of the
7 inconsistencies in rural development, as stated above. The Board of
8 County Commissioners and Prosecutors put those two items together for
9 interpretation.

- 10
- 11 • Deborah Flynn – Asked Kneip if the decision is posted on a website.
 - 12
 - 13 • Chair Mahan – Also asked if the decision could be obtained digitally
 - 14 or via hard copy, depending on what the individual Planning
 - 15 Commission members preferred.
 - 16

17 Kneip – Will arrange with staff to get copies to the Planning Commission
18 members. The decision is almost a year old at this time. It is difficult to
19 find on the GMHB's website because every decision made is listed. Kneip
20 reiterated how large a project the ten-year Comp Plan review is for staff.

- 21
- 22 • Flynn – Noted that all of the wooded forestry issue has a long history
 - 23 and that the issues can be reviewed with the new Planning
 - 24 Commission members as a group with those who have been on the
 - 25 Planning Commission for a long time.
 - 26

27 Kneip – Since 1998, nothing has changed on the designation of Rural
28 Wooded lands even with the implementation of the Comp Plan policies.
29 Because of no development regulations, they have been one dwelling per
30 20 acres for a very long time. The only change here is that the Comp
31 Plan policies are going back to the previous iteration.

- 32
- 33 • Gustavson – Most of Kitsap County's large land parcels were
 - 34 chopped into 20 acres a long time ago. In other jurisdictions, 20-
 - 35 acre parcels are becoming quite attractive sales items. Asked if it
 - 36 was appropriate to pass a motion to go before the Board of County
 - 37 Commissioners.
 - 38

- 39 • Chair Mahan – No it is not appropriate at this time.
- 40

1 • John Taylor – Asked Kneip if there are any counties in Washington
2 State that do not participate in the Growth Management Act. Also is
3 there any way for Kitsap County to opt out of this?

4
5 Kneip – Yes, but unsure of the number. She reads it those counties with
6 certain growth rates are subject to GMA while others are not. Kitsap
7 County falls under the growth rate requirement. As to the second
8 question, not without a legislative change. It is rumored that there could
9 be many changes to the GMA in the legislature next year. It has been
10 amended every year since 1990.

11
12 • Jenniges – For clarification, he restated the information being
13 presented today and asked if the ordinance revision require public
14 notice and public input.

15
16 Kneip – It will be a public hearing before the Board of County
17 Commissioners. However, because the County is under a GMHB order, it
18 is not the same as a typical Comp Plan amendment process. It is exempt
19 from public process.

20
21 • Chair Mahan – Assumes that after next week, an appeal to the
22 GMHB would not appear favorable to overturn something that
23 complies with something they have ordered in the beginning.

24
25 Kneip – By August 9, 2005, the Board of County Commissioners must take
26 legislative action, followed by Kneip filing with the GMHB a statement of
27 actions taken to comply. After that, the parties to the case below, can
28 challenge whether or not the action taken to comply is adequate. There
29 will be a hearing before the GMHB on this issue. Doubts that reinstating
30 what was previously approved would be found invalid.

31
32 • Jenniges – This also will be impacted by the Critical Areas
33 Ordinance relative to appropriate buffer widths.

34
35 Kneip – It is different because it states pro-property boundaries. It is about
36 buffers within a clustered area and the aggregation of lots. This would be
37 to buffer the cluster itself from other boundaries and residences. It could
38 be tied to the Critical Areas Ordinance if wetlands or streams appear on a
39 cluster site. Kneip addressed a previous question posed by Jenniges
40 relative to past lot size development of 2 ½ acres. There is still an
41 opportunity to place a house on a 2 ½ lot in rural areas if it is a pre-existing

1 lot. This is the argument the County has made to the growth Board under
2 reasonable measures. This argument will probably need to be decided in
3 court. The court system looks favorably on vested rights and lots. The
4 GMHB hinted strongly in its last decision on Reasonable Measures that
5 the County should be looking at lot aggregation to correct the balance in
6 the rural areas. This will probably be the next step.

- 7
- 8 • Chair Mahan – Thanked Kneip for her time. Stated that it was clear
9 that when it went before the Planning Commission last time, it was
10 not fully developed. He is not surprised to be at the current stage.
11 There is a sense of fairness that is not being attained by the
12 County’s lack of ability to deal with this issue. He is certain
13 personally that if the Board of County Commissioners and
14 Department of Community Development addresses this with a
15 serious methodology, that it will result in a product that satisfies the
16 GMHB, environmental interests and to some extent, a sense of
17 fairness to property owners who did lose a property value ten or
18 more years ago. He hoped it does not take that long to get back to
19 this issue.

- 20
- 21 • Jenniges – Not sure he feels comfortable that the old ordinance will
22 be approved again. He again referenced there is no purchase of
23 property on the County’s part and that taking of private property and
24 basically telling the property owners that they cannot use their own
25 property without just compensation will be disputed. He sees
26 nothing in the ordinance allowing for such compensation.

- 27
- 28 • Chair Mahan – Understands but this battle was lost in 1996.

29
30 Scott Diener – Nothing further from staff.

- 31
- 32 • Tom Nevins – After meeting, he would be happy to explain the
33 difficulty and problems involved with writing development
34 regulations. The ordinance being repealed caused more problems
35 that it solved.

36
37 Vivian Henderson – Sat on the committee and expressed interest in
38 explaining some of the problems.

- 39
- 40 • Chair Mahan – Assumed the Planning Commission is now moving
41 into a discussion on the Critical Areas Ordinance.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

- Gustavson – Presented the other Planning Commission members and staff with a paper regarding Cross Direction and Confusion in Development of Critical Areas Ordinances. He then reviewed the issues listed in the paper.
- Mahan – Reminded Gustavson he didn't have to read in verbatim. He may enter the entire document into the record and highlight the important issues.
- Chair Mahan – Although interested in allowing people the chance to have their say, however he suspected Gustavson's paper will lead to a general discussion, one that is not listed on the agenda of this Special Work/Study. Asked that Gustavson submit his paper for review by County staff and Planning Commission members then discuss it at the next regularly scheduled meeting. This would be August 9, where the Critical Areas Ordinance will be the only scheduled item of discussion. This is a full month prior to the date discussed for a joint public hearing with the Board of County Commissioners.
- Gustavson – Does not agree with this.

A motion was made by Lary Coppola and seconded by Frank Mahaffay that the Critical Areas Ordinance be tabled and not be forwarded for review by the public until the concerns expressed by members of the Planning Commission are fully addressed and included as appropriate in a new draft of the Critical Areas Ordinance. The new draft should display proposed changes from the existing 1998 Critical Areas Ordinance.

Discussion

- Deborah Flynn – Asked how the Planning Commission could work on the Critical Areas Ordinance in such depth as depicted on Gustavson's paper without a public hearing to get the citizens' opinions. The Planning Commission may have its own opinion but believes its job is to listen to the public as well prior to forming a recommendation.
- Tom Nevins – Voted no and to proceed as proposed. The Planning Commission has been involved with the public process since

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 2, 2005

1 January of 2003. There have been several meetings, this is the
2 second draft and concerns have been expressed. Preference would
3 therefore be to move forward to joint public hearing(s) with the Board
4 of County Commissioners, after which a recommendation can be
5 made on changes the Planning Commission's might wish to send
6 forward to the Board. Discussion can be held on each change.
7 Thinks the process has been two years in the making. The first
8 deadline was missed and the County will be lucky to meet the next
9 one of December 1, 2005. Thinks it is time to move forward.

- 10
- 11 • Jenniges – Concerned in that the Planning Commission members
12 have expressed concerns, but the County staff's responses have
13 appeared to be from a predetermined outcome and are cursory in
14 nature. He thinks staff is turning a deaf ear to the Planning
15 Commission's thoughts on this. He doesn't care how long it takes.
16
 - 17 • Coppola – The Planning Commission has expressed concerns,
18 asked questions continually but has not received satisfactory
19 answers to the questions. That is the reason for his motion. Thinks
20 it is a waste of everyone's time. No problem taking this to the public
21 but wants the questions answered first.
22
 - 23 • Gustavson - Does not know how anyone can read draft two when it
24 is merely a mark-up of the unapproved draft one. There is no way to
25 compare apples to apples without the original ordinance to compare.
26
 - 27 • Mahan – Believes the Planning Commission's role is to advice and
28 with that he repeated the motion and called for the vote.
29
 - 30 • Coppola – Included in his motion a request for responses also to
31 Gustavson's paper submitted today.
32

33 **THE VOTE:** Aye-5, John Taylor, Michael Gustavson, Lary Coppola, Dean
34 Jenniges and Frank Mahaffay; Opposed-3, Deborah Flynn, John Ahl and
35 Tom Nevins. The Chair did not vote. Motion carried.

- 36
- 37 • Jenniges – Believes this will be a contentious hearing because the
38 public believes that any input has not made a difference. It is
39 perceived as a County land grab. Staff needs to look hard at the
40 buffer issues and habitat issues. Otherwise, it should be left up to
41 the County Commissioners to take the heat.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41

- John Taylor – Asked Mahan what he meant by the comment, “We will see what that means” in reference to passing this motion.
- Chair Mahan – Is unsure if the Planning Commission has the power to table this matter. No value is given one way or the other, he is just unsure what comes next. This may be a good way to find out.
- Frank Mahaffay – He understands the RCW relative to the Planning Commission to read that the Planning Commission does have the power to table this matter.
- Flynn – In response, she stated that there are many people who oppose this ordinance and issues have been avoided. However, there are also many citizens who want to see environmental protections in place the way they should be, in compliance with the GMA. She wants to hear from the public and she hopes her fellow Planning Commissioners will listen to both sides of the issue not just the ones that support their position.
- Gustavson – As a strong environmental supporter, he is concerned that what the Planning Commission puts forward, does not come back the way of the Interim Rural Forest matter. Wants to see this pass through the GMHB. Need to ascertain what the County is trying to solve, which is not stated by staff or citizen comments. He only hears that this is a critical area but wants to know what makes it critical. He said that every inch of the State of Washington is considered a wildlife preserve. It is also a question of should property be purchased that is unusable. It is a very big issue.
- Flynn – In deference to Gustavson’s comments, she thinks what the County has put forth is defensible, that the work accomplished to date is defensible and have that the Planning Commission has gone through the process as required, and even beyond.
- Mahaffay – Any recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners, need to realize their recommendation has an impact on people’s dollar. Taking this into consideration, one of the questions not yet answered by staff is the dollar value of unusable land. Need to be careful.

Kitsap County Planning Commission – August 2, 2005

- 1 • Coppola – Just wants County staff to answer his valid questions prior
2 to a public hearing.
3
- 4 • Nevins – Questions: 1) How much value is being removed from the
5 land via buffers, etc. The response may be of benefit. The response
6 may be that there is an additional value to the land because of the
7 protections provided for streams and wetlands. 2) Takings. The
8 courts can decide on this issue. The Planning Commission is not
9 empowered to decide this. His understanding is that none of the
10 buffer requirements have been considered takings in the past and it
11 is his belief that the future will look the same.
12
- 13 • Chair Mahan – Requested a meeting next Tuesday, location
14 unknown. He requested that at the next meeting, if motions are to
15 be made that they be in writing and that position statements be in
16 writing in a concise format. He agreed that the motion is to stop all
17 action on the Critical Areas Ordinance if it is within the Planning
18 Commission’s powers to do so.
19

20 The Planning Commission reviewed the upcoming meetings section of the
21 agenda.
22

- 23 • Taylor – As a commission, the members should rely on the chair to
24 convey their wishes to staff.
25
- 26 • Chair Mahan – Staff will be consulting with the Prosecutor’s Office
27 and the Board today.
28
- 29 • Jenniges – Because the Critical Areas Ordinance is not advertised
30 and not on the agenda, perhaps the motion is out of order.
31
- 32 • Chair Mahan – The risk taken is that of being in violation of the Open
33 Meetings Act and a more general ethical responsibility to the public a
34 chance to be heard.
35
- 36 • Coppola – If the motion is found to be inappropriate, he would like
37 the Critical Areas Ordinance to be the first item on the next agenda.
38
- 39 • Gustavson - The rationale finding the motion appropriate should be
40 in writing and signed by someone.
41

1
2 **11:15 AM** - No further business being heard a motion was made by Mike
3 Gustavson and seconded by John Taylor that the meeting be adjourned.

4
5 **APPROVED** this ____ day of _____, 2005.

6
7
8
9
10 _____
11 **Monty Mahan, Chair**

12
13
14 _____
15 **Holly Anderson, Secretary**

16
17 **EXHIBITS:**

- 18
19 **A. Agenda for August 2, 2005**
20 **B. Agenda Summary packet for repealing portions of Ordinance**
21 **311-2003 regarding Rural Wooded Policies**
22 **C. Executive Summary for repealing portions of Ordinance 311-**
23 **2003 regarding Rural Wooded Policies**
24 **D. Comments on CAO Draft Two written and submitted by**
25 **Michael Gustavson**
26 **E. Letter to the Board of County Commissioners from Vivian**
27 **Henderson, Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners with**
28 **attachments regarding review of Kitsap County's 2nd Draft**
29 **Critical Areas Ordinance by Dr. Robert N. Crittenden**
30 **F. Cross Direction and Confusion in Development of Critical**
31 **Areas Ordinance submitted by Michael Gustavson**
32 **G. Cover letter with the Central Puget Sound Growth**
33 **Management Hearings Board Final Order and Decisions**
34 **regarding the 2003 and 2004 Comprehensive Plan**
35 **amendment appeals transmitted to the Planning Commission**
36 **members**
37 **H. Planning Commissions Journal**
38 **I. Motion prepared by Lary Coppola**
39 **J. Public notice for August 2, 2005 Special Work/Study Session**