



The Sentry News Letter
insideKAPO | Jan. 2, 2011 | kapo.org

Happy New Year

KAPO's Mission Statement

1. To free private property from unreasonable government regulation
2. To work for responsible wildlife habitat protection and for conservation of natural resources
3. To support those who defend the rights guaranteed to owners of private property by the United States and Washington State Constitutions

Editors Note:

Protecting The Shore From What?

A Day at Puget Sound Regional Council

How to Join KAPO

Editors Note: There are only two articles this month. Both are very large and very important. If you have any questions please e-mail to VivianKAPO@wavecable.com and we will respond.

Protecting The Shore From What?

by Michael Gustavson, Director

To Larry Keaton
Director of Community Development
Kitsap County
Port Orchard, WA 98366

Re: Shoreline Master Plan Update: I am submitting this letter as part of the official County record

Dear Mr. Keaton,

I object to using Washington State Department of Ecology's (DOE) drift cells each containing a number of near-shore assessment units (NAU) technique as the basis for updating the Shoreline Master Plan for Kitsap County and request instead that scientifically justified criteria be created by Kitsap County that can be applied, parcel specific, to each request for a building permit.

As I will show, DOE's approach, by its very nature is neither defensible from the perspective of science, nor does it pass the test of logic. The only changes to shoreline will be achieved as the result of individual building permit applications and these are submitted only on a single parcel basis, not for many thousands of feet of shoreline as defined in DOE's drift cells/near-shore assessment units. The drift cells and their NAUs are scored based on features such as the existence of bulkheads and pier. Later, I will show DOE has offered no proof these cause harm to the marine environment and are merely used as covers for a much different agenda. Indeed, thorough review of the scientific literature showed no harm to the measured marine environment.

A more defensible approach is to provide measurable criteria of actual harm to the marine environment from a structure being built within 200 feet of the shore.

Monday evening, December 7, I attended the County Planning Commission and Shoreline Master Plan Task Force joint public hearing. Many speakers gave thoughtful and constructive comments. In retrospect, the problem to be solved needs to be defined from a different perspective than the one currently being taken by Department of Ecology and Kitsap County Department of Community Development.

We need to define the problem we're trying to actually solve. Will the resulting regulations solve the problem to which we will have agreed? First off, it must be convincingly demonstrated that a solvable real problem actually exists in the first place.

Is our problem to improve the marine environment for the creatures who live in the salt chuck, or to improve the esoteric appearance of man-made structures? Are these two objectives at all related, and if so, how is that relationship scientifically demonstrated? Are we to protect the beach or the 200 feet landward from the beach, and for what purpose?

To this point, we've looked at the shore through the eyes of humans, ignoring the biology of the marine environment with the assumption that our actions have somehow degraded the salt chuck. We've begun with the assumption that all harm comes from man-constructed bulkheads and docks, without peer reviewed scientific justification. Perhaps this seems reasonable to us, but not to the fish. As I showed members of the County Planning Commission and Shoreline Master Plan Task Force during the public hearing, from Dr. Don Flora's review of the Battelle Bainbridge Island assessment for Department of Ecology, 72% of surf smelt and 49% of sand lance spawn in front of bulkheaded ("armored") parcels. Eelgrass is found in front of properties with bulkheads as frequently as in front of properties without bulkheads. As a child, I always saw the greatest concentration of fish was under the fishing docks in our neighborhood. Alleged "stressors" seem to have no correlation to DOE's alleged "stressed" biology. The entire basis for DOE's proposal appears flawed and without merit.

From the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife map I provided at the public hearing, spawning of forage fish occurs on north-facing (perhaps shaded) beaches as frequently as on south facing beaches which are never shaded. Some of them spawn in quiet bays while others of the same species spawn next to relatively swifter water. Spawning fish ignore some apparently good quality spawning beaches for no reason apparent to humans.

We've made the assumption that vast reaches of beach (drift cells and their near-shore assessment units) share equivalent characteristics. Is this true from the perspective of the marine creatures? When we create regulations, with the underpinning of vast generalities, the temptation as we've now seen in other counties' updated Shoreline Master Plans is to again create "big, dumb no-touch buffers", typically 150 feet wide that don't solve any proven biological problem in the salt water.

We've overlooked that marine creatures live in the water and the only thing that effects their world is the quality of the liquid stream that enters the water in which they live.

The resident salt chuck creatures live in a world much different from our terrestrial world. It is filled with fish and bird created fecal matter, sperm, eggs, dead and decaying creatures, all eating one another. They have vast multitudes of progeny with the hope that two might reach reproductive maturity. It turns out that clear, clean salt water is in fact more of an ecological desert.

As offered by Mr. Bob Benze, with expertise in Puget Sound water quality:

"Ecology already knows about water quality -- as they are charged with maintaining it under their delegation from EPA of Clean Water Act enforcement. The EPA establishes water quality criteria for the chemicals of concern using a standardized laboratory testing procedure found in their Guidelines for Deriving Numerical National Water Quality Criteria for the Protection of Aquatic Organisms and Their Uses.

This is designed to limit concentrations of toxic chemicals to values that will protect the most sensitive aquatic species. Point source discharges have met these limits under NPDES permits for decades. The current concern is that some stormwater outfalls and other non-point sources occasionally exceed these limits. However, dilution in the Sound brings these concentrations well below the limits within a short distance from the outfalls -- thus the water quality in almost all of Puget Sound exceeds, by wide margins, EPA water quality criteria.

There are exceptions. In a few poorly flushed areas such as the Lynch Cove area of Hood Canal, and some of the South Sound Inlets, dissolved oxygen becomes a problem at certain times of the year. Also, along some shorelines, the health department finds some fecal coliform exceedances. Sometimes this is traced to failed septs and sometimes to farm animal waste entering streams. Other times the source is not certain -- and as Don Flora notes, dog poop and bird poop are likely suspects. Also, there are occasional ammonia exceedances.

Visit www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/index.html and <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/2008/index.html> for a discussion of Ecology's water quality programs, and to see the Washington State "impaired" waterbody locations and which standards are exceeded. The queries of these websites for the Puget Sound do not reveal any significant cause for concern regarding chemistry in the runoff.

Indeed, in the literature, there is virtually no cause-effect evidence that aquatic species in the Puget Sound region are jeopardized today by chemistry from the shore -- with the exception that shellfish with high fecals cannot be consumed (one solution is to transport them to clean water so they can eliminate the fecals before they are sold for consumption by humans).

Mercury, PAHs, PCBs (sometimes with associated dioxins and furans) and some other toxins are found in fish and aquatic mammal tissue. About a quarter of the mercury is from natural sources and the rest is largely from air deposition -- a product of coal burning. US plants have to meet EPA air quality criteria. Much of the airborne mercury comes from abroad. PCBs have been banned from commerce since the early 1970's. The residuals are ubiquitous and no amount of regulation will change their presence. PAHs, heavy metals and other toxins are found in some historic hot spots in sediments but are decreasing, largely due to natural processes. Usha Varanosi from NOAA has an ongoing study of the effects of PAHs on English Sole --

one of the only scientifically-defensible studies with historical significance in the Puget Sound."

In the natural environment, numerous animals and birds along the shore as well as all the marine creatures excrete their wastes into the water. This is natural and a necessity for the thriving food column in which they live. The salt chuck has been typified as being nitrogen and phosphorous starved, even in it's natural state.

When a house is built along the shore, but the water entering the salt chuck is not contaminated by it, the fish see no degradation.

It has been shown most harmful substances are cleaned by passing the liquids over six feet of grass. Water passing through brush, however, actually flows over shaded dirt and is not cleaned. "No touch" brush buffers do nothing to mitigate oils and chemicals transiting the terrestrial environment. Roof-top drains, running over a narrow grassy buffers are proven to be cleaned adequately. Low-impact development techniques allow percolating water to be cleaned of contaminants by the biological activity found in common dirt, typically within two feet of travel. This has been commonly proven, even with septic drain fields.

Please note: No scientific proof of harm contrary to the above has been offered by DOE

"Drift cells" have been the dominant focus of Department of Ecology's argument for updating Kitsap's Shoreline Master Plan. Compared with land slides entering our beaches, which are rare events, as are severe storm waves, the train of twenty waves that slaps our beaches from each passing ship in mid-Sound occur several times each day. These wave trains have been documented destroying bulkheads and beach stairways and dramatically reshape beaches. Drift cells that may be occasionally seen in Puget Sound are in most cases not created by natural events. It is doubtful Department of Ecology would have us forego our marine economy by eliminating the shipping industry to mitigate this. A good deal of silt enters Puget Sound as a result of rainfalls after clearing roadside ditches; perhaps more than from shore-side sloughing.

Bulkheads in most cases have been constructed to protect upland parcels from beach erosion. In most cases the bulkheads have been in place for many decades and bulkhead/beach conditions we observe today are steady state. Any drift cell movement is caused by the impact of ship-created wave action. No proof by DOE to the contrary has been offered.

Regarding shore-side habitat protection, there are very few terrestrial creatures who depend on the first 200 feet of shoreline. Sea Otters have a vast range of perhaps 20 miles and occasionally re-visit a specific location. Once the neighborhood is fished or clammed-out, they move on. Habitats friendly to the few shoreline-dependent endangered or threatened bird species are fairly specific and well documented. Much of the shoreline is inhabited by creatures that are not dependent on proximity to salt water and are commonly found throughout the entire upland County.

There is a very high opportunity cost associated with protecting the first 200 feet of the entire 250 miles of shoreline for creatures of interest who don't live on most of it. Tax value lost from restrictions on expensive shoreline homes must of necessity, be shifted to the upland owners.

Department of Ecology's approach of characterizing drift cells as long as 4.66 miles (Hansville), some containing as many as 13 near-shore assessment units (NAU) as having fairly uniform characteristics is extremely flawed. Adjacent or nearby shoreline parcels vary dramatically parcel to parcel from step bluffs to salt water marshes, even within the same NAU, which are often each a half mile in length. Some parcels in an NAU have bulkheads and some do not, yet all are colored "red".

Recall, above, DOE has provided no measured data to support the contention that bulkheads harm the salt water environment. Regulations written because of some perceived degradation issue on one parcel of property in an NAU should not be used as a construction penalty for a neighbor, who doesn't have the same issue. NAUs, to be of any practical use, must be defined at the individual parcel level.

Building permits are applied for one parcel at a time. The impact on the water column must be evaluated based criteria that can be applied to that single parcel. Unless we apply these criteria to each and every building permit and road project in the entire county, little will be accomplished in protecting the marine environment. A number of court cases support this per-parcel concept.

If water quality were actually an issue, one of our missions would then be to define acceptable limits for water quality entering the salt chuck from each parcel. We must be mindful that the salt chuck water column could be violated by water often traveling a great distance in storm drains. If water quality were actually an issue, all those water sources would need to be addressed in our shoreline document and applied to new building permits based on the geographic constraints of that particular parcel.

If environmental "restoration", is to be part of this project, we must first specifically determine what problems are to be solved. Is there merit in the "solution"? What is the cost of "solving" the problem?

This approach of addressing the named potential insults to the salt chuck will do far more to improve the salt water environment than punishing the owners of an entire drift cell/NAU, who may not have created any real problem in the first place.

With Low Impact Development construction techniques and our knowledge of natural cleaning processes, we now have the tools to appropriately address any remaining water quality problems. We need to take the appropriate actions that will really do some good and not take the path of building another bureaucratic monster that retains the problem at ever greater cost.

The approach currently being proposed by Department of Ecology would likely result in adding another layer of restrictive land use regulation to shoreline property owners, accomplish nothing for the marine environment and further escalate our cost of housing.

I recall from Monday evening's presentation, Dr. Don Flora commented that his analysis of the Bainbridge Island near-shore data indicated that approximately 97% of the influence on habitat was from natural causes and that only 3% could be attributed to human-caused activities. So we as the public can't be too strong in our contention that the county's (non?)-scientific approach is not just biased, it is just plain wrong. Courts have consistently ruled against the "precautionary approach" of over-regulating land uses to provide for science which may someday appear.

We find ourselves at a fork in the road regarding the update of the Shoreline Master Plan. Are we intent on improving the "looks" of the shoreline or are we to take expensive actions that will not improve the salt water for marine organisms? We need to publically define the problem we're trying to solve before we lurch off to create "solutions" that may well not become solutions at all, but create further problems.

Department of Community Development's Patty Charnas reminded us at Monday evening's meeting that Department of Ecology has final approval authority and if Kitsap's shoreline regulation didn't meet the expectations of DOE, they would draft our plan for us. This is simple implied extortion and

does not justify our proposing a plan which is scientifically unsupportable and economically unsustainable.

From our Shoreline Master Program update we need a set of practical, scientifically based guidelines that can be used by our Department of Community Development when approving shoreline building permits that in fact prevents harm to the marine environment in Puget Sound.

I would be pleased to offer further clarification or assistance, if requested.

Respectfully submitted for the record,
Michael A. Gustavson

Copies to:

Washington State Representative Ms. Jan Angel
Washington State Representative Mr. Larry Seaquist
Washington State Senator Mr. Derek Kilmer
Washington State Department of Ecology, Attn: Messrs. Geoff Tallent, Joe Burcar
Kitsap County Commissioners
Kitsap County Planning Commission members
Kitsap County Shoreline Master Plan Task Force members
Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners
Lofall Community Corporation
Kitsap Sun
Director of Community Development, attn:
 Mr. David Greetham
 Ms. Patty Charnas

A Day At Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) **PSRC Transportation Policy Board meeting, 12/9/10** **by C.J. Shank, Vice President**

Not that I want to, but a promise must be kept, and if I don't write this down now I'll never do it.

Today's meeting started off with the alarm intruding on deep REM sleep when I finally must have dropped off around 5 AM. Got on the 7:20 out of Bremerton OK - lucky I left at 6:45 AM because the Gorst backup was brutally slow. Sinclair Inlet Bridge? Not while we're under their thumb.

On the boat one of my galley companions was an Army vet, Viet Nam era, doing the the required heart valve checkup over in the Seattle VA hospital and our conversation chanced upon Nascar. He's a big fan, so I asked him if he knew who Chris Endresen was. He'd never heard of her (or the ex Mayor of Port Orchard) who both killed the Nascar track here with their testimony to our State Legislature that no one in Kitsap County wanted the track here. He was astounded, and went on about all the jobs and great times we'd have had if it had been built. Then I told him I was on my way to a meeting at PSRC, who has hired Chris as the new Regional Economic Development czar. Apparently they were impressed with her economic development abilities. On the way over the Nimitz is being brought in but we can't see it.

The boat gets in about an hour before the meeting so I have time to get some coffee, read a little, and go up to the meeting, where I get the agenda handout, sign in for KAPO, and sit in the peanut gallery. Lots of unoccupied peanut seats, so when the big headed purple hair girl sits right in front of

me I contemplate moving so I can see better, but decide to stay. Eventually I move my chair to the right half a foot to see past her, and when she gets up I slide her chair a little to the left. All is swell as the meeting grinds on until the guy behind me, and remember there are lots of empty chairs to sit in, decides to start kicking my chair every once in a while. I moved my chair a little more to the right thinking that would get me out of range. Finally at the next bump, I turn around and see a PSRC employee, and I whisper to him, "Please stop kicking my chair". His eyes bug out and he says to me, "You're kidding!" So I knew I was back in grade school again. So I looked him in the eye and said, "No, I'm not kidding, it's bothering me." Apparently he was able to control himself the rest of the time.

Now you have a little idea of the fun we can have at the PSRC. Here's the 11 item agenda - I'm going to go through each item briefly with some discussion and observations.

1. Call to order at 9:30 AM
2. Report of the Chair, Claudia Balducci
 - a. Farewell to outgoing TPB Members and Alternates
 - b. Nothing to say really except they weren't re-elected, but Claudia did her best to extol their virtues.
3. Communications and Citizen Comments
 - a. Paul Locke, a regular at this agenda point, gave his usual warning about overspending and excessive government debt, and to kill ferry service on Southworth, Bremerton and Port Townsend routes because we can't afford them. Claudia thanked him and moved on.
4. Director's Report, Charlie Howard
 - a. PSRC got another award! This from the Association of American Planning Organizations (AAMPO) for the year 2010, Outstanding Overall Achievement for the Transportation Vision 2040 Document. (You recall that this is the 3 years in the making many millions of dollars and hours spent concluding that people need to get out of their cars and onto mass transit in order to save the planet from global warming, and if they insist on driving, it must be in electric cars through electronic tollgates collecting user fees in lieu of gas taxes.)
 - b. Also his staff is making progress setting up an expenditure tracking process for Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality (CMAQ) funds, and for Federal Transit Agency (FTA) funds. Nice to know that they are getting closer to following where and when the money is going - maybe next year. They joked about the acts of god that extended CMAQ funds before, mentioning that floods come to mind, but not to worry because they've got sandbags ready. (But, the Rainbow Sign means it's not going to be a flood this time around.)
5. Consent Agenda
 - a. Approval of minutes of TPB meeting held 10/14/10.
 - b. Recommend Certification of Poulsbo's and Fife's Comprehensive Plans, and Amendments to Kenmore's, Sea Tac's, Burien's and Edgewood's Comp Plans. (PSRC staff recommendations include *Add policies and provisions to address reducing greenhouse gas emissions and adapting to impacts related to climate change.* OK - maybe PSRC doesn't follow developing news, but the Climategate scandal revealed that the IPCC goosed the data to make it appear global warming was man made months ago, and the latest Wikileaks confirms that 'global warming' aka 'climate change' is a political effort designed to redistribute the wealth and economy of the USA to the rest of the world, essentially reducing us to the new 3rd world status. If you listen to Rush, he was talking about his prescience nailing this supposition way back in the late 1980's. If any of you are curious, check out the documents on PSRC's website - you will come to understand just how essential to Comp Plan certification are the Comp Plan's adherence to the PSRC's 'recommended' Countywide Planning Policies (CPP's). Example: *Although Poulsbo is outside of the air quality attainment designated in the central Puget Sound basin, automobile trips to and from the city affect the region's air quality. The comp plan should include a discussion of regional air quality issues, especially in the Transportation Element, and reference federal and state air quality requirements, as*

well as guidance and direction provided by the Puget Sound Clean Air Agency. Come on Poulsbo! You're dumping too much air pollution into traffic free King County! One comment to Fife impressed me -The city has included policies and strategies that work towards developing land use patterns and transportation alternatives that support air quality efforts. In non-planner speak, this means Fife has conceded to requiring rural homeowners to sell and move into Fife so they can take mass transit or ride bicycles. Yes - regional consistency demands that all member jurisdictions adhere closely to the CPP's. Money saving idea! All Comp Plans are essentially the same so all jurisdictions can just use the PSRC preferred template and transportation analysis instead of toiling over their own. Of course that would put many DCD planners out of a job, so redundancy is a good thing unless you are a toll taker at the Tacoma Narrows Bridge, where it's OK to be replaced by a camera.)

c. Unanimous Approval!

6. Action Item

a. Authorize Release of PSRC Coordinated Grant Program 2010-2011 Proposed Program of Projects for Public Review and Comment. (PSRC has partnered with the WSDOT to streamline grant applications for Transit Agencies and Non-profit. Thirty projects are listed from preserving shuttles, to job access drivers, to pay your pal programs, to the lowest ranked on the list, Move People Efficiently 1 & 2, by Kitsap Transit. The 30 projects total \$7.8 million requested, but, and I got real confused here, I think about \$2.3 million is available.)

b. Unanimous Approval.

7. Action Item

a. Transportation 2040 Prioritization Work Program. Robin Mayhew told us that the PSRC staff went to visit Atlanta, Philadelphia, San Francisco, and Vancouver, BC to see how they did it and if we could learn some new and better ways to do it. Apparently everybody does it about the same - now we know! So far there are around 32 volunteers to be on the Transportation Policy Board (TPB) Working Group, who will report back to the TPB, who will collaborate with the Growth Management Policy Board and the EDD?, on recommendations to the Executive Board, who will make final recommendations to the General Assembly in spring 2012, at the Spring Equinox (just kidding). They will use 7 evaluation criteria and 11 values to weigh proposed projects for achieving the goals of mobility, human health, and environmental health, and rank them for approval into the Final Recommendation. You can see there are a lot of steps and people involved to get to the healthiest Final Recommendation. Maybe PSRC could just trade all our smoke belching cars with China for their bikes?

b. Unanimous Approval. Now for the best item yet.

8. Discussion/Future Action

a. PSRC Transportation Recommendations to the 2011 legislature, Charlie Howard. This draft document evoked the most consternation of the day. Although the list was not prioritized, the first up was

i. Address the transit crisis. The recession has drastically hurt local transit revenue that now may have to face unprecedented and substantial cuts if more revenue cannot be found. The region supports immediate action to address the current crisis of transit service cuts. Discussion revolved around demanding that the legislature give local transit money in order to stay in business. One guy had the temerity to suggest that transit should begin to charge real cost fares, which run about \$5.20 per trip, or find another less obvious way to get the money - maybe out of property tax increases. After all, addressing climate change, CO2 reduction, economic justice, and so forth in the Transportation Vision 2040 Plan support and validate the Legislature's Growth Management Act.

ii. Provide Stable and Sustainable Funding for WSF. This caused the members to seek similar language in the

Transit section, since Transit was more significant to regional mobility by far than was the ferry system. A suggestion was made that WSF move money out of their capital program (vessel, dock construction) and put it into the Operations program. Apparently due to the artificially depressed oil supply and inflationary US dollar, running the boats was getting more expensive than fares could cover. Not a word was said about WSF being part of the State Highway System and therefore by State Constitutional Amendment, due gas tax revenue to cover all Operational Costs. But when charging tolls for operational costs at Snoqualmie Pass to offset WSF's demand for more revenue was brought up, Charlie Howard said he didn't like that idea. I noticed the picture on the wall, of a Ferry Boat approaching Seattle with the snow capped Olympic Mountains in the background, titled Promoting a Livable Region, General Assembly Vision 2020 Awards, apparently summing up the entire regional transportation picture. Funny how you always see the Ferries on the state maps, and tourist promotional literature, but the PSRC considers them relevant only to the Kitsap and Olympic peninsulas. In fact, when PSRC calculated the revenue that Kitsap had received by virtue of membership, they included WSF and other agencies as part Kitsap, boosting our revenue from \$20 million to \$50 million. This extra \$30 million in WSF, WSDOT, Port of Bremerton, and Kitsap Transit income is what CoCm Josh Brown says we will lose if we become a solo RTPO/MPO like Thurston County is. However, it is not likely that WSF will cease to be a part of the State Highway System just because Kitsap drops out of the PSRC. In other words, \$20 million plus \$30 million is still \$50 million whether you are a part of PSRC or simply a solo RTPO/MPO. Ok RTPO/MPO is Regional Transportation Planning Organization/Metropolitan Planning Organization - I really don't like typing that each time so please remember it, thank you.

iii. Provide Additional Revenue for Local Roadway Needs. The member from the Transportation Commission said that it did no good to just demand more money from the Legislature. Seems like the recession has also affected their budgeting process. How to generate new revenue from more creative taxation is their big problem. The only guy who ever says anything about reducing expenditures is good old Paul Locke at the start of the TPB meeting, but that is unthinkable.

iv. Make significant progress in controlling storm water runoff from state and local roadways. This of course is in order to restore the health of Puget Sound. (Having no long range monitoring programs studying the 'health of Puget Sound', as is evident from the Shoreline Master Plan update required by the Department of Ecology, it is easy to assert that Puget Sound suffers from storm water effluent. I wonder if the nesting pair of eagles that moved in down the way here are a symptom of failing Puget Sound health? This illustrates to me the complete disconnect these intelligent people have with the realities we all live with. Case in point is again the complete fraud global warming is, and yet no one at the TPB will admit to it. The environmental religion has its True Believers despite all the evidence, and they appear to predominate at the Deliberation Table. How much do those cultist de-programmers run per hour?)

v. Finish what has been started. The members wanted this moved up to Number 1. Charlie Howard said the numbers did not signify priority but only as a reference tool for

discussion. They'll take the numbers off later and just use bullet points to illustrate that all recommendations have equal weight.

vi. Fund locally developed priorities on state and local systems. By this time everyone wanted out, so Claudia mercifully said we'd get back to it later, check out the attached meeting schedule for 2011, meeting adjourned.

b. No Ayes asked for.

On the boat ride back, I watched a Coast Guard vessel escort one of our Subs approaching the turn into Rich Passage, a pretty rare and awesome black silhouette. Thank God for the Navy. Coming out of Rich Passage were the two Navy tugs that had probably gotten the Nimitz into port. It was puzzling to me to see that the tugs were well left of the Red Channel buoys leaving Rich Passage. Maybe the channel is plenty deep there when the tide is up. Good to be back home - we have nothing in common with the PSRC.

How to Join KAPO

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.

Dues are pro-rated quarterly. Contact Vivian Henderson for correct amount based on the date of your application.

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 at www.kapo.org or contact Executive Director Vivian Henderson, at 360-710-8560 or via [email](mailto:).