

The Sentry

Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners
www.kapo.org
www.insidekapo.wordpress.com

February 2010

In this issue:

[Notes From the Presidents Desk](#)

President Tim Matthes

[Let's Talk About Density](#)

Executive Director Vivian Henderson

[Why I Joined KAPO](#)

KAPO Director Jackie Rossworn

[Bigger Buffers That Couldn't](#)

Dr. Don Flora

[Did Founding Fathers Envision Such Wealth Redistribution?](#)

Director Bob Benze

[Lynn M. Stuter on Disrupting the Delphi Technique](#)

Ed (reproduced from www.learn-usa.com/transformation_process/acf002.htm)

[Amy Ridenour National Center for Public Policy Research President](#)

Ed (talks about the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change)

[What's Up](#)

[How to Join KAPO](#)

Notes From the President's Desk

President Tim Matthes timcm@wavecable.com

I want to thank all of our members who contributed to our victories in the battle to protect our constitutional right to own property. Each of you know that just to own property isn't enough. We must be able to use it! I started to list the members that provided KAPO with the knowledge, expertise, finances, and labor that made last year so successful. I realized that I would need to list every name on our membership list. The fact is, each and every one of our members worked together to further our cause. Thank you one and all.

Next month our Sentry will have new editors: Jackie Rossworn rosswarnjr@wavecable.com and Bill Henderson henderso@wavecable.com. If you have contributions for next month's issue, e-mail Jackie at the above address. Reminders: if you have written a letter to the press, and they have not printed it, send that letter to us. It might show up here in the Sentry or on our web site at www.kapo.org or on our blog at www.insidekapo.wordpress.com

New in this month's issue is **What's Up**. It will contain special announcements, calls to action, and help wanted announcements that will list projects that need our members' help. Please check this section out and consider attending a meeting for KAPO.

Let's Talk About Density

Executive Director Vivian Henderson viviankapo@wavecable.com

In case you haven't noticed, there's a whole lot of density going on around here. Urban planners have taken over the country and they are convinced that the only way to effectively deal with humans is to pack them, tightly, in urban centers. Houses are 5 feet apart; back yards are 5 feet wide. These planners must protect the rural areas from "human disturbance". So, in the cities you go!

No place for a swing set. No room for backyard Bar-B-Qs. Call it "Smart Growth" or "Sustainable Development" but what it means is the government knows what is best for us. And they will tell us where to live, how to live, what to eat, and how to get from one place to another. And it will not be in a POV; "privately owned vehicle" ~ in other words ~ your car. We will be herded into mass transit. Apartment dwellers will be packed in even tighter. As we speak, high rises are being planned that will change the character of our cities and towns.

And we're the lucky ones ~ at least for the near future. Our grandchildren and their children will suffer the painful limitations and loss of freedom that is imposed on us when we are forced to live in "high" density development.

Take Tokyo, for example. In the recent past National Geographic TV channel featured a 2 hour program "Tokyo ~ Living Small in the Big City". I'd like to share with you some startling facts I learned from that program.

There are 35,000,000 (million) people in Tokyo. In greater Tokyo there are 50,000 people per square mile. In Kitsap County there are 586 people per sq. mile. The average sized single family home in Tokyo is 678 sq.ft. More recent "Penguin" houses are 900 sq ft. Do they have a yard?? You must be dreaming!

About half of the people in Tokyo live in apartments. Some of the older apartments are 100 sq.ft. These apartments have no bathrooms. There are community toilets shared by other tenants. Bathing is done in public bathhouses.

There are newer apartments called "Mansions" (I did not make that up) that are 200 sq. ft. The entire apartment is in a 10'x 20' space. There are larger apartments of 269 sq. ft. These

apartments have a very small refrigerator, a 2-burner range, small microwave, teeny shower and a very small sink on top of the toilet in the very teeny bathroom.

High ceilings and glass walls allow light and air to create a sense of space. Reflective surfaces on windowsills and counters give occupants a “view” of the sky. Imagine getting a chance to look at the sky from a reflection on the counter.

What kind of problems do people have when they are jammed together like this? Here are just a few. They have no room for pets. But there are vendors that will rent you a cat or dog to play with in a petting area and for an additional \$7 you can have your picture taken with the animal. (If there is no room for pets, how can they have children?)

There is no room for company. Friends and family meet in public places like restaurants and bars.

There is too much exposure and not enough room for intimacy in these dwellings. So you rent a room by the hour at one of the many “Love” hotels. You pick the room you want from several computer images and you pay an “unseen” clerk. These “Love” hotels are used mostly by married couples.

People must live this way in Tokyo. They just don’t have the land mass. In America we don’t have a land mass problem; we have a “too many urban planners” problem who honestly believe they know what is best for us. We have a problem with “elected officials” who give too much power to these planners and agencies that champion smart growth and other controls on our lives.

In America will we ever experience such crippling density and restraints on our way of life as the people in Tokyo? I doubt it. But based on the gradual tightening controls on our land, resources and lives that I have witnessed the past 20 years, I am very alarmed. If something isn’t done to stop government’s powerful control of every phase of our lives, the freedoms you and I have enjoyed will only be a distant memory to our children and their progeny.

2010 is an important election year. Think about these issues when you are selecting candidates for public office and Vote! Who you vote into office does matter ~ greatly!

Vivian Henderson
Executive Director
360-710-8560; viviankapo@wavecable.com

Why I Joined KAPO

Director Jackie Rossworn www.rosswornjr@wavecable.com

When I retired I was at a loss of what to do with my newfound time. Maybe I could join a women's club or gardening group? It just didn't feel right to do nothing since I've always worked.

Then one day Karl Duff showed up on my front porch. I didn't know Karl very well, but had been in many meetings with him about things in our neighborhood (our private water system, proposed sewers etc). He had a flyer in his hand from Evergreen Freedom Foundation. I took it

and read it. What an organization! Then the idea came to me that maybe property rights was my retirement calling.

There was a lot of rumbling in the county about GMA (Growth Management Act), SMA (Shoreline Management Act), PSRC (Puget Sound Regional Council) and other organizations that seemed to be interfering with our property rights to use our property and even the taking of property! It stirred a passion in me that said, "This is America and I am an American and no one can take my **"PROPERTY"** away. I needed to find out more information.

I called Karl and talked with him for a while. He told me about Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners and what they stand for. He asked me to come to a Board of Directors meeting. I was amazed with their group and surprised at their size. The Board of Directors was a group of people from every walk of life. Their science board is one of the best. The staff works hard and is well accomplished. Board officers kept everyone organized and on subject. Their knowledge, professional attitude plus commitment sold me, but I wanted to attend a few more times to **MAKE SURE**.

Finally I joined KAPO and really started to learn what all the different organizations were doing and what they represent and stand for. I must say this is one of the most dedicated and responsible groups I have ever had the pleasure to work with.

Thanks Karl, you are welcome on my front porch anytime.

Bigger Buffers That Couldn't Dr. Don Flora (a real scientist)

Do wider buffers work better? Maybe, if they promote greater percolation of storm water into the ground. But do we want tainted storm water assaulting aquifers? And if not tainted, do we care about water-quality buffering in the first place?

It's well known that diminishing returns arrive with wider buffers: Each ten-percent increase in buffer width produces a smaller and smaller percentage increase in protection. (1)

Largely unknown outside the research community is the low overall correlation between protection and buffer widths. An EPA review of 46 studies showed that only 14 percent of the variation in protection could be explained by buffer widths. (2) In an analysis of 29 studies I found only 11 percent explained for phosphorus and 10 percent for nitrogen. These figures mean that 85-90 percent of the variation found among buffers' pollutant protection is related to factors other than buffer width.

I also found that there is no significant upward trend in protection with wider buffers. (3) Remarkably, a 100-foot buffer is not significantly more protective than a 15-foot buffer.

Together these findings indicate that wide buffering is probably not a solution to storm water-borne stream, wetland and tidewater problems. Wide buffering will be disappointing at best and terribly costly in terms of land-use options foregone. (4) It appears that protection will lie mainly in stopping pollutants at their sources.

What about wildlife-habitat buffers? Should tidewater buffers be widened for the greater welfare of wildlife? What if wildlife-oriented buffers didn't appear in our updated Shoreline Master Program? Some comments next month.

(1) For instance see Brooks, Kenneth M. 2007. Supplemental best available science supporting recommendations for buffer widths in Jefferson County, Washington. Port Townsend: Aquatic Environmental Sciences. P. 36.

(2) Mayer, Paul M., et al. 2005. Riparian buffer width, vegetative cover, and nitrogen removal effectiveness: A review of current science and regulations. Cincinnati, Ohio: US Environmental Protection Agency, National Risk Management Research Laboratory. P. 9.

(3) Flora, Don. Regression analyses of buffer-performance data arrayed in Desbonnet, Alan, et al. 1994. Vegetated buffers in the coastal zone - a summary review and bibliography. Coastal Resources Center Technical Report 2064. Narragansett, RI: University of Rhode Island, Rhode Island Sea Grant. Table 4.

(4) Pizzimenti, John J. 2005. Efficacy and economics of riparian buffers on agriculture lands - State of Washington. Englewood, CO: GEI Consultants.

Did Founding Fathers Envision Such Wealth Redistribution?

Director Bob Benze www.robert@benze.com

The health-care debate raised a fundamental question: Exactly what are the rights the citizens of the United States are entitled to under the Constitution?

An examination of the Constitution shows that the Founding Fathers were singularly concerned with limiting the power of the government to control and coerce its populace. They well understood there have always been people desiring power to control other people, with oppressive governments being the historic norm. Their goal was to put the people in charge, with a system of checks and balances to thwart "factions" that could take control of the levers of power.

The first 10 constitutional amendments, the Bill of Rights, were designed to guarantee people freedom from abuse by an overzealous government. Nothing more!

But in some circles there is another definition of rights — centered on the concept that the government is legally empowered to forcibly take the money that one person has earned and give it, in various forms, to someone who has not earned it — arguably for the common good.

For example, President Franklin D. Roosevelt's Economic Bill of Rights would have guaranteed everyone a job with a living wage; businesses would have freedom from unfair competition; everyone would have the right to a home, the right to medical care, the right to an education, and the right to recreation.

The means to achieve such noble goals invariably lies in social programs that allow the government to redistribute wealth — an idea especially appealing to intellectuals who have enjoyed ivory-tower protection from the real world.

The problem is that wherever "from each according to their ability, to each according to their needs" has been employed as public policy, it has failed dismally — dramatically illustrated in the differences between Western Europe and Eastern Europe when the Berlin Wall came down.

Redistribution policy invariably destroys the monetary-reward incentive that drives potential employers and investors to take personal financial risk; and, conversely, marginalizes any incentive for people to work in gainful employment to fulfill their needs and desires when they realize they can get a free government ride.

The old Soviet joke "They pretend to pay us and we pretend to work" describes the end game of such a system. Or, as Margaret Thatcher once said, "The trouble with socialism is that eventually you run out of other people's money."

Today, in chasing this utopian vision, we are not only running out of our citizens' money, we are fast spending the yet-to-be-earned resources of our children and grandchildren.

The national debt is \$12 trillion. When the unfunded liabilities of Social Security, Medicare, prescription drugs, etc., are included, the total is a whopping \$106 trillion — an obligation of \$346,000 for every single citizen of the United States. This is not only unsustainable; it is wildly irresponsible, with the looming potential to bring the country to financial ruin.

Yet the Congress and the administration continue to spend like drunken sailors on all the new rights they have found, that they claim people need and want. Why? Lord Acton understood it perfectly when he said, "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

But the American people are waking up to the fact that there is something fundamentally wrong with massive wealth-redistribution programs like the health-care bills currently in Congress. Most would agree to a safety net for those who are unable to fend for themselves, but they are increasingly rejecting the notion that there can somehow be a universal free lunch.

The government our nation's Founding Fathers devised worked. Our government today doesn't.

Lynn M. Stuter on Disrupting the Delphi Technique

Ed (Lynn M. Stuter March 1996)

Ground rules for disrupting the consensus process (Delphi Technique) — when facilitators want to steer a group in a specific direction.

- 1) Always Be Charming.** Smile, be pleasant, be courteous, moderate your voice so as not to come across as belligerent or aggressive.
- 2) Stay Focused.** If at all possible, write your question down to help you stay focused. Facilitators, when asked questions they don't want to answer, often digress from the issue

raised and try to work the conversation around to where they can make the individual asking the question look foolish, feel foolish, appear belligerent or aggressive. The goal is to put the one asking the question on the defensive. **Do not fall for this tactic.** Always be charming, thus deflecting any insinuation, innuendo, etc, that may be thrown at you in their attempt to put you on the defensive, but bring them back to the question you asked. If they rephrase your question into an accusatory statement (a favorite tactic) simply state, "that is not what I stated, what I asked was...(repeat your question)." **Stay focused on your question.**

3) Be Persistent. If putting you on the defensive doesn't work, facilitators often resort to long drawn out dissertations on some off-the-wall and usually unrelated, or vaguely related, subject that drags on for several minutes – during which time the crowd or group usually loses focus on the question asked (which is the intent). Let them finish with their dissertation/expose, then nicely, with focus and persistence, state, "but you didn't answer my question. My question was...(repeat your question)."

Remember...

**always be charming,
stay focused, and
be persistent.**

Never, under any circumstance, become angry. Anger directed at the facilitator will immediately make the facilitator "**the victim.**" This defeats the purpose, which is to make you the victim. The goal of the facilitator is to make those they are facilitating like them, alienating anyone who might pose a threat to the realization of their agenda. [People with fixed belief systems, who know what they believe and stand on what they believe, are obvious threats.] If the participant becomes the victim, the facilitator loses face and favor with the crowd. This is why crowds are broken up into groups of seven or eight, why objections are written on cards, not voiced aloud where they are open to public discussion and public debate. It's called crowd control. It is always good to have someone else, or two or three others who know the Delphi Technique dispersed through the crowd; who, when the facilitator digresses from the question, will stand up and say nicely, "but you didn't answer that lady's/gentleman's question." The facilitator, even if suspecting you are together, certainly will not want to alienate the crowd by making that accusation. Sometimes it only takes one occurrence of this type for the crowd to figure out what's going on, sometimes it takes more than one.

If you have an organized group, meet before the meeting to strategize. Everyone should know their part. Meet after the meeting to analyze what went right, what went wrong and why, and what needs to happen the next time around. **Never meet during the meeting.** One of the favorite tactics of the facilitator, if the meeting is not going the way he/she wants, if he/she is meeting measurable resistance, is to call a recess. During the recess, the facilitator and his/her "spotters" (people who wander the room during the course of the meeting, watching the crowd) watch the crowd to see who congregates where, especially those who have offered measurable resistance. If the "resistors" congregate in one place, a "spotter" will usually gravitate to that group to "join in the conversation" and will report back to the facilitator. When the meeting resumes, the facilitator will steer clear of those who are "resistors." Do not congregate. Hang loose and work the crowd. Move to where the facilitator or "spotters" are, listen to what they have to say, but do not gravitate to where another member of your team is.

This strategy also works in a face to face, one on one, meeting with anyone who has been trained in how to use the Delphi Technique.

With thanks to Sandy Vanderberg, Peg Luksik and others

©March 1996; Lynn M Stuter

Amy Ridenour on The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Ed (reprinted from the National Center for Public Policy Research)

Statement of National Center for Public Policy Research President Amy Ridenour on What the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Must Do in the Wake of Unfolding Scandals

Washington, D.C.: Statement of National Center for Public Policy Research president Amy Ridenour on what the IPCC must do in wake of unfolding scandals:

In the wake of admissions [the IPCC knew all along](#) it was putting bogus science in its 2007 Assessment Report, that the false prediction was included specifically for its "[impact on policymakers and politicians](#)," and that this allegedly was covered up as long as it was because the IPCC chairman was raising money for his personal pursuits based on the prediction, the IPCC must immediately take three steps to restore its credibility. If it does not, the Obama Administration should use its influence to have it shut down.

To restore its credibility, the IPCC should:

- 1) Return its half of the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize and replace its current leadership;
- 2) Adopt and enforce a strict conflict-of-interest policy;
- 3) Adopt an uncompromising transparency policy, which includes the release of all data, all emails, all meeting minutes, all drafts and all other documentation related to the development of assessment reports and all other policy pronouncements, in the past and from this date forward.

Step one would signal to the world that the IPCC is serious about reform.

Step two would reduce, though not eliminate, the temptation faced by IPCC personnel to tailor conclusions to moneymaking, career or fundraising opportunities for themselves or affiliated businesses or institutions.

Step three would be a constant reminder to IPCC personnel that their work genuinely will be peer-reviewed, in a universal sense, which is as it should be given the gravity of the IPCC's work.

Politicians relying upon IPCC recommendations are considering policies that would limit the access of billions of people to low-cost energy in an effort to reduce carbon dioxide emissions.

This is a grave step that should be undertaken only if the alternative is worse. As many have considered the IPCC to be the institution that can answer that question, given the gravity of these circumstances, no level of transparency and ethics can be too high.

Global warming believers and "skeptics" do not often agree, but this is a subject upon which we should be able to reach a true consensus. No one benefits when the IPCC knowingly publishes bogus science.

The National Center for Public Policy Research (<http://cmpgnr.com/r.html?c=1580112&r=1578764&t=106365974&l=1&d=91492247&u=http%3a%2f%2fwww%2enationalcenter%2eorg%2f&g=0&f=91492256>) is a non-partisan educational foundation based in Washington, DC. It receives the vast majority of its funding from hundreds of thousands of individual donors; and receives less than one percent of its funding from corporate sources.

By Amy Ridenour

What's Up

Do you have 3-4 hours of free time during the month? Why not take that time and attend your city, county, or port commission meetings? This is where the decisions are being made for the future of Kitsap County. If it has to do with private property at any level, we need to know about it. KAPO stands for your property rights and needs your help to cover various meetings in your area. We can't be everywhere, but with your eyes and ears we can cover many meetings. If you don't know when and where local meetings are, please contact KAPO. We could sure use the help and you might be surprised how easy it is to cover a meeting for your organization.

Special meeting notice! For KAPO Waterfront Property Owners.

Patty Charnes, Natural Resources Manager for Kitsap County, will give our members a briefing on how the Shorelines Master Plan Update Process for Kitsap County is progressing. The meeting will be held at the Kitsap Association of Realtors headquarters in Silverdale. The Address is 3689 Munson St. N.W. (just behind Kitsap Tractor and Equipment on Silverdale Way.) The date is February 25, 2010, at 2:00 PM to 4:00 PM. come prepared to ask your questions.

Please Save this date: 2-25-2010

Plan to attend KAPO's annual dinner meeting. This is the annual meeting where we will elect/install your 2010 board of directors. According to our bylaws the new board of directors will then elect the 2010 officers. The meeting will be held at the AA China Buffet East Bremerton Thursday February 25, from 5:00pm to 8:30pm. Our guest speaker will be Bob Williams from Evergreen Freedom Foundation. We will have special raffle prizes for this meeting so come and be a KAPO winner.

Contact Tim Matthes 360-440-6483 or Vivian Henderson 360-710-8560 with questions.

How to Join KAPO Membership Information

Membership in Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners is available at three levels

Voting Membership is open to applicants and includes voting rights. Membership dues are \$100 per year.

Associate Membership is also available. Associate Members do not enjoy voting rights. Associate Membership dues are \$25 per year.

Life Membership, voting membership for the life of the member, is available for a single payment of \$1000.

The list of KAPO members is not released to the public. Individual member information is not used for any other purpose than the specific business of KAPO.

For more information or to receive a membership application visit the KAPO web site, www.kapo.org or contact Executive Director Vivian Henderson, viviankapo@wavecable.com or Phone: 360-710-8560