| 1                     |                              | KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION   |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|
| 2                     |                              | Administration Building - Commissioner's Chambers   |
| 3                     |                              | August 20, 2019 @ 5:30 pm   |
| 4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8 | made, s<br>reader<br>http:// | minutes are intended to provide a summary of meeting decisions and, except for motions should not be relied upon for specific statements from individuals at the meeting. If the would like to hear specific discussion, they should visit Kitsap County's Website at <a href="www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm">www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/pc/default.htm</a> and listen to the audio file (to assist in locating ation, time-stamps are provided below). |
| 10                    | Membe                        | ers present: Kim Allen (Chair), Aaron Murphy (Vice Chair), Gina Buskirk, Mike Eliason, Tom  |
| 11                    |                              | Joe Phillips, Richard Shattuck, Jim Svensson  |
| 12                    | Membe                        | ers absent:   |
| 13                    | Staff pr                     | esent: Peter Best, Darren Gurnee, Dave Ward, Liz Williams, Amanda Walston (Clerk)   |
| 14                    |                              |   |
| 15                    |                              | 5:39:50 PM  |
| 16                    | A.                           | Call Meeting to Order   |
| 17                    | В.                           | Adoption of Agenda  |
| 18                    |                              | <ul> <li>MOTION: Joe Phillips motions to adopt the agenda as presented.</li> </ul>  |
| 19                    |                              | SECOND: Gina Buskirk  |
| 20<br>21              |                              | <ul> <li>MOTION: Mike Eliason moves to amend the agenda by adding item B-1,<br/>Appreciation of Tom Nevins' service.</li> </ul>   |
| 22                    |                              | SECOND: Richard Shattuck  |
| 23                    |                              | <ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in favor – Motion Carries</li> </ul>   |
| 24                    | B-1.                         | Appreciation of Tom Nevins' Service to the Kitsap County Planning Commission  |
| 25                    |                              | • Chair Allen thanks Mr. Nevins, on behalf of the Planning Commission for his service.  |
| 26<br>27              |                              | <ul> <li>Mr. Murphy thanks Mr. Nevins, noting his input and leadership is invaluable and<br/>everlasting.</li> </ul>  |
| 28<br>29              |                              | • Staff thanks Mr. Nevins for guidance and years of thoughtful service and insight and presents him with a gift of appreciation.  |
| 30                    |                              | خ   |
| 31                    |                              | 05:39:19  |
| 32                    | C.                           | Approval of Minutes   |
| 33                    |                              | • 07/02/19  |
| 34                    |                              | • MOTION: Mr. Phillips moves to approve the minutes of 07/02/19 as presented.   |
| 35                    |                              | SECOND: Jim Svensson  |
|                       |                              |   |

| 1                          |    | <ul> <li>VOTE: 5 in favor; 3 abstentions – Motion carries</li> </ul>   |
|----------------------------|----|--|
| 2                          |    | • 07/30/19   |
| 3<br>4                     |    | <ul> <li>By unanimous consent the minutes of 07/30/19 are postponed to the next regular<br/>meeting.</li> </ul>  |
| 5                          | D. | General Comment  |
| 6                          |    | Hearing none, this item is closed  |
| 7<br>8                     | E. | Work Study & Public Hearing: Timber Harvest Code Update – Scott Diener, DCD DSE<br>Manager   |
| 9<br>10<br>11              |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Diener notes a request for revision from Mark Mauren, Ueland Tree Farm<br/>Representative, that major replanting in the buffer should not be required in all cases.<br/>That is the only change proposed in addition to what has already been submitted.</li> </ul>   |
| 12<br>13<br>14<br>15       |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Diener briefly reviews the Timber Harvest Code Update process, including<br/>outreach with stakeholders, noting an outpouring of comments received were specific<br/>to special practice permits and aerial application of pesticide; DCD was able to contact<br/>commenters and explain that classification is not part of this update.</li> </ul>   |
| 16                         |    | 5:46:48  |
| 17                         |    | Chair Allen opens the Public Hearing   |
| 18<br>19                   |    | <ul> <li>SPEAKER: Martha Wehling, Forest &amp; Environmental Policy Counsel for Washington<br/>Forest Protection Association (WFPA).</li> </ul>  |
| 20<br>21<br>22             |    | <ul> <li>Here to commend staff for reaching out to all stakeholders, listening and<br/>considering their input; they responded and worked with people above and<br/>beyond all the way through this process.</li> </ul>  |
| 23<br>24<br>25             |    | <ul> <li>WFPA is here to support this code update, and it will simplify this permitting<br/>process. WFPA strives to work with the community and believes this is a<br/>good plan, and it does support the community and stakeholders.</li> </ul>  |
| 26                         |    | 5:48:07  |
| 27                         |    | SPEAKER: Jeremy Annunson   |
| 28<br>29<br>30<br>31<br>32 |    | <ul> <li>We've been working w county on forestry practices and have some<br/>experience with Washington State and DNR. On forestry, there has been a<br/>lot of confusion as to who is in charge of regulations, with Department of<br/>Ecology, Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife, and there have been lots of issues in<br/>the past several months.</li> </ul>  |
| 33<br>34<br>35<br>36<br>37 |    | <ul> <li>My only thought is to try and streamline County regulations for forestry and<br/>timber harvest. Follow the DNR handbook, it's already very specific and<br/>outlined with no ambiguity. As far as making it stricter than the handbook,<br/>you can decide that later, but at least we would be following very specific<br/>guidelines and regulations put forth by WA State. This handbook would be a<br/>good baseline, instead of Kitsap County trying to reinvent the wheel</li> </ul> |
| 39                         |    | 5:50:15  |

| 1<br>2                         | •   | Chair Allen calls twice for additional speakers, hearing none, closes public testimony.   |
|--------------------------------|-----|---|
| 3<br>4                         | •   | <b>QUESTION:</b> Chair Allen asks if staff has plans to integrate the DNR handbook mentioned in testimony.  |
| 5<br>6<br>7                    | •   | <b>Steve Heacock, DSE Planner &amp; SEPA Coordinator,</b> confirms the County does refer to and use the DNR handbook, but the responsibility is to review and apply all County code, which makes for a layered review.  |
| 8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13 | •   | For a DNR-led review, they have lead and the County has no jurisdiction. It is difficult, when a conversion activity happens after the fact, to then guide the applicant through the process when other regulations or requirements, applicable through County code, were not followed. Grading, stormwater control, other factors go into a conversion permit, so if something comes through having met DNR's regulations, but missing those pieces and the work is already done, the county still has to apply all those portions of the code before the conversion permit can be approved. |
| 15<br>16<br>17<br>18           | •   | Mr. Heacock notes this stage is putting the code in place now and then there will be public outreach and awareness, and also permit process streamline where the County is looking at different things like combining Site Development Activity Permits (SDAPs) with the timber harvest permit.   |
| 19<br>20                       | •   | <b>QUESTION:</b> Mr. Shattuck asks about outreach to customers who have only worked with DNR, how can they be included or connected.  |
| 21<br>22<br>23<br>24           |     | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Diener notes all past individuals applied, and listed timber<br/>owner have been contacted; also using GovDelivery to broadcast wide and<br/>far; largest word of mouth communication has been via the Kingston<br/>Environmental Coalition.</li> </ul>  |
| 25<br>26                       |     | <ul> <li>Mr. Heacock also notes a partnership with DNR staff, they have been<br/>ambassadors for people working with DNR permits to spread the word.</li> </ul>   |
| 27                             |     | 5:58:45   |
| 28                             | • ; | Draft Findings of Fact are distributed for review.  |
| 29                             | •   | QUESTION: Mr. Murphy asks for clarification on the changes from the previous draft.   |
| 30<br>31                       |     | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Diener notes the change at bottom was previously shown,</li> <li>18.16.070B is the only change to tonight's materials.</li> </ul>  |
| 32<br>33                       | •   | <b>MOTION:</b> Mr. Murphy moves to accept the packet as modified, and staff's recommendation to update Kitsap County Code 18.16, Timber Harvest.  |
| 34                             | •   | SECOND: Mr. Phillips  |
| 35                             |     | <ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in favor – Motion Carries.</li> </ul>  |
| 36<br>37<br>38                 | •   | Mr. Shattuck expresses appreciation to staff; as there have been commendation from all sides on how well staff has worked with the public and stakeholders. This process has been very open and very impressive.  |
| 39<br>40                       | •   | Mr. Svensson agrees, noting comments from WFPA were very compelling and led to comfort is approving this update.  |

| 1              |    | <ul> <li>MOTION: Gina Buskirk moves to adopt the Findings of Fact at this meeting.</li> </ul>  |
|----------------|----|--|
| 2              |    | SECOND: Mr. Shattuck.  |
| 3              |    | <ul> <li>VOTE: Unanimous in favor – Motion Carries</li> </ul>  |
| 4              |    | 6:04:42  |
| 5              |    | RECESS   |
| 6              |    | 6:08:25  |
| 7<br>8         | F. | Work Study: 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment (CPA) Update – Liz Williams, Peter Best DCD PEP Planners   |
| 9              |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck notes he will recuse himself from Item 10 of this update.</li> </ul>   |
| 10<br>11       |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Best reviews the schedule for the 2019 CPA Update, noting the CPA Process was<br/>detailed in the previous Works Study.</li> </ul>  |
| 12<br>13       |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Best reviews the material management options for paper (binder) and also<br/>displays the Online Open House site that also houses the electronic version</li> </ul>   |
| 14<br>15<br>16 |    | <ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Chair Allen asks, and Mr. Best confirms, the online Open House<br/>will be current with all documents. Chair Allen requests the online link to this item be<br/>included on the agenda itself.</li> </ul>                            |
| 17             |    | 6:17:55  |
| 18<br>19       |    | <ul> <li>Ms. Williams reviews the Clarifying Edits tab, noting process, quantity of edits as well<br/>as that these are not substantive changes but rather clarifying.</li> </ul>  |
| 20<br>21       |    | <ul> <li>Changes from noted in amendment in red show switch from urban low intensity to<br/>urban high intensity land use designation.</li> </ul>  |
| 22<br>23<br>24 |    | <ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, on page 23 of 24, reference to a decision being<br/>finalized and recorded would follow the waiting period for any appeals, including<br/>Superior Court. This is not a change, only a clarification.</li> </ul>   |
| 25<br>26<br>27 |    | <ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Shattuck asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, the Silverdale Design Standards amendment incorporates the entirety of the standards into the appendix, instead of footnotes. No changes proposed, only codifying location.</li> </ul> |
| 28<br>29       |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck notes some significant changes have taken place, including<br/>designations that no longer exist, such as the West Hills area.</li> </ul>  |
| 30<br>31       |    | <ul> <li>Ms. Williams notes this only refers to the location in code. Any substantive<br/>changes would have to be amended through the sub-area planning process.</li> </ul>   |
| 32<br>33       |    | <ul> <li>Chair Allen asks if any work can be done to address these before we end the<br/>2019 CPA Update process.</li> </ul>   |
| 34<br>35<br>36 |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Best notes this is a great example of items of interest, that are<br/>cataloged and then reviewed with the BoCC in the docketing process. This<br/>will be added.</li> </ul>  |
| 37<br>38       |    | <ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Murphy asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, ADU Language will be addressed in the Zoning Use Table Update.</li> </ul>  |

| 1<br>2               | •     | Mr. Shattuck would consider making a motion to exclude the Mixed Use reference to West Hills from this amendment, as it no longer exists.  |
|----------------------|-------|--|
| 3<br>4<br>5<br>6     | •     | Mr. Best notes the standards are adopted by reference, they are already existing and in effect, the only thing this does is establish it as a published document. Clarifying edits are non-substantive changes, major changes are not part of the annual update process.   |
| 7                    |       | 6:32:55  |
| 8                    | , , . | TAB 4 – Mineral Resource Overlay   |
| 9<br>10<br>11<br>12  | •     | Ms. Williams reviews last year's work with MRO projects prompted staff research to find remove small parcels that contain existing residential or commercial developmen and small undeveloped parcels across unincorporated Kitsap County, these are shown in Attachment C1.   |
| 13                   | •     | QUESTION: Chair Allen asks about parcel owner notification.  |
| 14<br>15<br>16<br>17 |       | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams confirms owners were notified twice of the opportunity to apply if their reclamation process was complete; also sent notification about the process in January, and a letter stating whether they qualify for the MRO recommendation for removal from the overlay. Once explained no mine is going on their property, they supported the process.</li> </ul> |
| 19                   | •     | QUESTION: Chair Allen asks why the map hasn't been updated in 15 years.  |
| 20<br>21<br>22       |       | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes development regulations changed in 2003,<br/>and it was missed back then. Discovered in last year's update process so we<br/>are cleaning it up this year.</li> </ul>  |
| 23<br>24             | •     | <b>QUESTION:</b> Mr. Nevins agrees this is a good action to take, asks about remedies for land disturbed by Mineral Resource activities.   |
| 25<br>26             |       | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes an annual bond is kept current if there is<br/>potential for activity.</li> </ul>  |
| 27                   |       | 6:43:50  |
| 28                   | •     | Ms. Williams reviews maps of parcels proposed for removal, shown in Attachment A2  |
| 29<br>30             | •     | <b>QUESTION:</b> Mr. Eliason asks if any of the phone calls referenced included objections after the process was explained.  |
| 31<br>32<br>33<br>34 |       | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes one party, living near an existing operation,<br/>asked how projections can be made and code based on something we have<br/>no inventory of. Removing the MRO from underlying zone does not<br/>preclude a prop owner in the future; they could still pursue that.</li> </ul>  |
| 35<br>36<br>37<br>38 |       | <ul> <li>The need for a countywide MRO Inventory was identified last year and<br/>brought to the BoCC in the annual review. The MRO was created with<br/>limited available tools at the time, and was placed over properties that<br/>already had existing businesses. This seeks to protect in a logical sense.</li> </ul>  |
| 39<br>40             | •     | QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, the 3 acre size threshold was a conservative aim.  |

| 1              | 6:56:36   |
|----------------|---|
| 2              | BINDER TAB 5 CENTERS  |
| 3              | <ul> <li>Mr. Gurnee reviews the proposed update to policies designated regional growth</li></ul>  |
| 4              | centers, industrial employment centers and Land Use Policy 45, which designates   |
| 5              | major military installations and countrywide military installations. Framework was  |
| 6              | recently updated by Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). Changes are shown in   |
| 7              | Attachment A of the updated materials.  |
| 8              | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes these designations are very significant, as they largely determine</li></ul>   |
| 9              | how transportation funding is awarded.  |
| 10             | <ul> <li>Mr. Ward notes Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) is still negotiating, so</li></ul>  |
| 11             | additional changes may follow. While the Transportation 2050 Regional Plan is not   |
| 12             | complete yet, its framework has been adopted.   |
| 13             | <ul> <li>Mr. Gurnee notes Military installations were not designated centers, but in</li></ul>  |
| 14             | recognition of the major significance to our area, they were deemed installations.  |
| 15             | <ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Murphy asks if these areas are being labeled as part of larger efforts</li></ul>   |
| 16             | for funding or other plans such as creating or identification for Urban Growth Areas  |
| 17             | (UGAs)?   |
| 18             | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Ward notes designations do affect funding and this gives</li></ul>   |
| 19             | recognition to areas of significance. Designations do not mean they will  |
| 20             | move an area into a UGA.  |
| 21             | <ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Mr. Gurnee confirms Port Gamble is a</li></ul>  |
| 22             | Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD). It also has the unique   |
| 23             | historic distinction, which adds additional criteria.   |
| 24<br>25       | <ul> <li>BINDER TAB 6 – Silverdale/Kingston Unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UUGA)         Association &amp; Future Incorporation     </li> </ul>  |
| 26             | <ul> <li>Mr. Best reviews new geographic framework discussed by PSRC in Vision 2050</li></ul>   |
| 27             | centered around transportation and high transit. One of the factors in qualifying   |
| 28             | criteria is incorporation or identification for future incorporation, so this statement   |
| 29             | must be made.   |
| 30<br>31<br>32 | <ul> <li>GMA assumes all UGAs will eventually become incorporated. This policy aims to clarify a very straightforward statement to identify this. Policy 25 is being amended, there is intent for future association by City of Bremerton but is in negotiation with the City.</li> </ul> |
| 33             | <ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck notes Silverdale is presented as 'should vs. may' incorporate. Some will</li></ul>  |
| 34             | take that as a directive from Kitsap County, and will loudly oppose it  |
| 35             | <ul> <li>Mr. Best notes the Planning Policy requires the statement and shifting from 'may to</li></ul>  |
| 36             | should' aligns with updated framework.  |
| 37             | <ul> <li>Mr. Best notes additional amendments will be discussed at the next Work Study.</li> </ul>  |
| 38             | <ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Eliason asks if outreach is only electronic or if postcard mailings are</li></ul>  |
| 39             | used?   |

| 1<br>2<br>3          |    | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Best notes it depends on the location of the site. Main<br/>communication is electronic and published legal notice, some smaller site<br/>specifics will also receive postcards.</li> </ul>   |
|----------------------|----|--|
| 4<br>5               |    | 7:14:45  |
| 6                    | G. | Work Study: Zoning Use Table Update – Liz Williams, DCD PEP Planner  |
| 7                    |    | <ul> <li>Ms. Williams briefly reviews included documents and attachments.</li> </ul>   |
| 8<br>9               |    | <ul> <li>QUESTION: Chair Allen asks where Wireless Communications are included or<br/>referenced.</li> </ul>   |
| 10<br>11             |    | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Mr. Gurnee notes it is not currently identified as a categorical use<br/>or zone, but is on the list to be added.</li> </ul>  |
| 12                   |    | 7:20:46  |
| 13                   |    | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes it is difficult to discuss the items without definitions.</li> </ul>  |
| 14<br>15             |    | <ul> <li>Ms. Williams notes Attachment 4, Footnote Analysis, links to the categorical use and<br/>definitions. Highlighted yellow has definitions that are not existing.</li> </ul>  |
| 16                   |    | <ul> <li>Chair Allen would like the same links included.</li> </ul>  |
| 17<br>18<br>19       |    | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes that the Bed &amp; Breakfast (B&amp;B) Vacation Rental an Guesthouses are<br/>proposed to have more process vs. the less process proposed for multi-family use in<br/>the same zone.</li> </ul>   |
| 20<br>21             |    | <ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Murphy asks about overarching internal discussion on why some<br/>things were included or excluded from UGA? A</li> </ul>   |
| 22<br>23<br>24<br>25 |    | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes independent staff review of purpose/intent of<br/>each zone, and currently level of permitting looked for conflicting purpose<br/>statements and land use across all zones. These are not recommendations<br/>at this point, intended as starting point for conversation and input.</li> </ul> |
| 26<br>27<br>28       |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Nevins notes in zones that are fairly protected, would like to see at least equal if<br/>not more levels; very liberal in urban low zones or larger to allow ACUP as permitted<br/>to help promote growth in UGA.</li> </ul>  |
| 29<br>30<br>31<br>32 |    | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes sources of extra time spent on discussion or differences would be<br/>helpful to hear about, so PC could talk that through as well. A second pass would be<br/>to look at staff recommendations. Line number, code, change proposed, or no change<br/>proposed</li> </ul>                               |
| 33<br>34             |    | <ul> <li>Mr. Murphy agrees, when a site specific is prepared, we get to read through it, learn<br/>the background and determination to inform discussion and consideration.</li> </ul>   |
| 35<br>36             |    | <ul> <li>Ms. Williams notes this is a pre-cursor to the recommendation phase, trying to make<br/>sure if there is something the PC wants to see or hear about, we address it.</li> </ul>   |
| 37                   |    | 7:31:08  |
| 38<br>39             |    | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes the PC can submit a list of the strongly felt points for discussion,<br/>round table might not be the best way to get through this in time.</li> </ul>  |

| 1        | 7:39:40   |
|----------|---|
| 2        | <ul> <li>Mr. Ward notes Kitsap is very liberal compared to other jurisdictions on residential</li></ul>   |
| 3        | zoning. Seattle area would never allow housing in commercial, it's only strip malls or  |
| 4        | retail centers.   |
| 5        | <ul> <li>Mr. Shattuck asks how to determine if we are attempting to help create a village or is</li></ul>   |
| 6        | it just a slow creep.   |
| 7        | <ul> <li>Mr. Ward notes some look at intent, are we putting in a local service or is it a broader</li></ul>   |
| 8        | more regional service, such as dry cleaner vs. veterinary office.   |
| 9        | <ul> <li>QUESTION: Mr. Murphy asks about the decision to remove the 1/3 component from</li></ul>  |
| 10       | the Kingston Urban Village Center (UVC) requirement because it didn't spur  |
| 11       | development as estimated. Now a fast ferry is coming, how does that change things.  |
| 12       | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes intent was to promote diversity and</li></ul>   |
| 13       | walkability, and one zone for the entire UVC didn't make sense, so it then  |
| 14       | allowed flexibility for structure to shift with the market vs. requiring on the   |
| 15       | front end.  |
| 16<br>17 | <ul> <li>Mr. Murphy believes letting the market dictate is a good mindset. Let's see if the changes you have in mind will do these things.</li> </ul> |
| 18       | <ul> <li>Mr. Ward notes there is recognition of barriers to investment here that</li></ul>  |
| 19       | must be balanced with goals and intent for communities.   |
| 20       | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes different generations produce different policy decisions</li></ul>   |
| 21       | and directions in planning. Someone might have wanted a store in a small  |
| 22       | neighborhood, now some say why do I need it when I can drive to the store?  |
| 23       | • QUESTION: Mr. Eliason asks about Vacation Rental, which indicates discussion needed   |
| 24       | <ul> <li>ANSWER: Ms. Williams notes the BoCC Special Projects team is reviewing</li></ul>   |
| 25       | short-term rentals, so we are waiting for results of their process before   |
| 26       | determining level of review.  |
| 27       | <ul> <li>Mr. Ward notes the Port Gamble LAMIRD is also undergoing a separate</li></ul>  |
| 28       | legislative process, so we will wait on that one as well.   |
| 29       | <ul> <li>Chair Allen notes Daycare Center and Family Daycare Center would be good for</li></ul>   |
| 30       | clarifications.   |
| 31       | <ul> <li>QUESTION/ANSWER: Mr. Eliason asks, and Ms. Williams confirms, the Self-Storage</li></ul>   |
| 32       | and Contractor Storage Yard are likely to be consolidated as Storage.   |
| 33       | 8:00:19   |
| 34       | <ul> <li>Ms. Williams asks if PC would like to mark this up and send comments to staff prior to</li></ul>   |
| 35       | the next level of review/cuts.  |
| 36       | <ul> <li>The PC encourage staff to note any areas they would like focused input on, early in</li></ul>  |
| 37       | the process. Any large concerns will be notes.  |
| 38       | <ul> <li>Mr. Ward and Mr. Murphy note definitions are important. Any that are not listed, but</li></ul>   |
| 39       | desired should be flagged.  |

| 1                          | H. Adminis       | trative Update – Dave Ward, DCD PEP Manager   |
|----------------------------|------------------|---|
| 2                          | •                | The first of two Assistant Director vacancies is on schedule to be filled by September.   |
| 3<br>4                     |                  | Commissioner Garrido has interviews scheduled to fill the PC vacancy in her district;<br>Commissioner Gelder has an appointment set for 8/26 to fill Mr. Nevins pending exit.   |
| 5                          |                  | 8:09:44   |
| 6                          | I. Good of       | the Order   |
| 7<br>8<br>9                |                  | Mr. Nevins suggests a local blog written by Ray Roger Gaye – Informed Kitsap.  Discusses what happen in meetings PC may not regularly attend around the county, cities or ports.  |
| 10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14 |                  | Mr. Nevins also notes that when considering whether decisions and actions are minor or not, consequences are involved. George's Corner was considered a minor adjustment on this level, but was invalidated by the Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB). |
| 16                         | Time of Adjourn  | ment: 8:11:25   |
| 17                         |                  |   |
| 18                         |                  | nth C-11  |
| 19                         | Minutes approv   | red this day of   |
| 20                         |                  | •   |
| 21                         |                  |   |
| 22                         |                  |   |
| 23                         | Kim Allen, Plant | ning Commission Chair   |
| 24<br>25                   | Mus              |   |
| 25<br>26                   | Amanda Walsto    | on, Planning Commission Clerk   |