



The Sentry News Letter

[insideKAPO](#) | Aug. 2, 2011 | [kapo.org](#)

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

Contents

Coming Events

President's Report

Executive Director's Report

Several Victories Scored with PLF

Environmentalists BAD for the Environment

To City Council Bainbridge Island

Results of Several Property Rights Cases

What Should Affordable Housing Be?

"PETITION"

How to Join KAPO

Coming Events

Directors Meeting, August 2

August 2, 2011, 1:00 to 3:00PM We will be meeting at the Kitsap County Association of Realtors Office, 3689 NW Munson, Silverdale, Wa. 98383. They are located in the 2nd house on the left up from Silverdale way. Parking is sparse, try to car pool if possible. The public is invited but would you please let us know you are coming. Contact Jackie if you have questions 360-990-1088

Dinner Meeting, August 25

We are back at the AA China Buffet for our August 25th 5:30pm Dinner Meeting, however there is a new twist.

They have changed their name to #1 Buffet. They are at the same address 3583 Wheaton Way E. Bremerton (across the street from McDonalds). Their prices have changed from \$13.60 including gratuity to \$12.00 p/p including gratuity. Now is the time to bring a friend or neighbor. Our speaker will be Eric Baker, Special Projects Manager, Kitsap County Commissioners Office. He will be speaking about preserving local farmlands to maintain and enhance the existing agricultural economy in Kitsap.

Kitsap County Fair, August 24th thru 28th

Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners will have a large booth at the fair to help aid the general public and affected property owners in understanding the soon to be updated Shoreline Master Program to be approved by our County Commissioners. We hope to answer your questions on buffering and set backs and how it will affect Kitsap County and land owners on the shores.

"I predict future happiness for Americans if they can prevent the government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of taking care of them." - Thomas Jefferson

PRESIDENTS REPORT

(below is testimony to the County Commissioners concerning a proposed change to subdivision ordinances on Title 16. As a result the revisions have been tabled for additional review)

July 12, 2011
Kitsap County Planning Commission
619 Division Street
Port Orchard, Washington 98366

SUBJECT: Review of Proposed Amendments to Kitsap County Code Title 16

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Since it is not feasible to list all of the problems and issues raised by the Proposed Amendments to KCC Title 16, the Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners would like to adopt the comments submitted by the Kitsap Realtors Association (KCAR) and Mark Kuhlman by reference. A review of those comments leads to an obvious conclusion that it is premature for the Planning Commission to be holding a public hearing and making an imminent decision regarding these Proposed Amendments without a more thorough vetting of the regulations in the public review process.

Like the Realtors, KAPO believes the public hearing review of the Planning Commission will not allow the kind of necessary interactive debate and consideration of the proposed changes when all the public can do is speak for "three minutes" and provide written testimony that few people read and digest.

When the issues are technical in nature with legal implications there are only a few people who are even capable of presenting testimony on this document. Other lay people, and we suspect that includes members of the Planning Commission, can realistically only present objections to what they do not like or believe is unworkable. If Mark Kuhlman's review comments are any indication, the professionals in the community are not satisfied with key provisions of the proposed amendments to recommend them for adoption.

KAPO respectfully requests that the Planning Commission table the proposed amendments until there has been the type of review conducted that was utilized last year (2010) in the update of the Rural and Resource Lands Element of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. That vetting process produced a much better document than would have been true had it just been submitted to the Planning Commission with limited prior discussion. The fact that Kitsap County received an award for that process should be indicative of the value of this kind of technical and citizen review.

1. We trust the Planning Commission will honor our request that the Proposed Amendments be tabled at this time. In the event that there is a decision to move forward to adoption without further detailed analysis and interactive debate we wish to add commentary about our key concerns. They are as follows: Kitsap County is expanding regulatory authority. We cite as witness to that point the proposal to cause sub dividers to include "non-motorized facility" provisions in their land divisions. This is especially problematic when the prior planning to make such provisions workable has not been completed or yet adopted by the County. Other examples are the proposed regulation of condominiums and boundary line adjustments. Other examples exist in the proposed regulation. KAPO has long opposed and will continue to oppose regulation for regulation sake.

2. Kitsap County requires so-called "legally binding agreements" (reference 16.24.050.3.b.iii). KAPO objects to such requirements and/or agreements that cause property owners to give up constitutionally protected rights to their property for supposedly some future benefit not directly linked to a public benefit evident at the time of platting. Any property owner will be advised by our organization that Kitsap County property owners cannot be forced to sign away their constitutionally protected rights.

3. Kitsap County is proposing to regulate or expand their regulations to address issues without first having documented the need for the regulation and the magnitude of the need. For example, no documentation has been presented for public review to indicate that there is a need to regulate Boundary Line Adjustments or Condominiums. The fact that there may be issues the County has had to deal with in the past is not indicative of a problem that requires legislation. Even if there may be some problems that Kitsap County staff have had to deal with no data has been presented to indicate the supposed problems rise to the level of "significant." And there has been no discussion of other possible remedies that might be effective to address the issue(s). It may be noted regarding Boundary Line Adjustments that Washington State Law, RCW 58.17.040(6) stipulates that Boundary Line Adjustments are not required to comply with the State Subdivision statute.

KAPO opposes any proposed legislation or amendments to legislation categorically when regulations are proposed without prior and proper justification. KAPO also opposes any proposed ordinance categorically that has provisions to take away constitutionally guaranteed property rights.

4. Kitsap County has limited funds and cannot adequately carry out its planning responsibilities and administer the regulations already adopted. Witness the fact that it cannot afford to keep its doors open five days a week. The cost of ordinance implementation called for by the proposed amendments has not been assessed and Kitsap County therefore is asking its citizens to write a blank check to attempt to cover all future costs associated with land division approval. This blank check includes costs for more staff and more interagency review all of which cost money.

It needs to be remembered that as costs escalate fewer citizens can afford to subdivide their land and eventually that translates into either a declining economy for the county or creates an environment where only the rich can subdivide. This is no small issue and bears much discussion.

5. Kitsap County is proposing to adopt land segregation / division regulations without a commitment to follow State law for timely processing of proposed subdivisions.

The foregoing while not reflective of the entirety of KAPO's review are our five biggest concerns. Some are long standing issues that our organization has consistently opposed like regulations proposed without a demonstrated significant need for the regulation. Several of our list of five are concerns that really must be addressed before these ordinance amendments are recommended for approval by the Planning Commission.

We trust the Planning Commission will grant our request that the proposed amendments be tabled for further study and interactive debate.

Respectfully submitted,

William M. Palmer, President
Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners

Executive Director's Report
by Jackie Rossworn, Executive Director

Thursday July 28th we had a fabulous Dinner Meeting. Our speaker was Jan Angel, always a hit. She informed us what was going on in Olympia and what she has been working on this past year. She has worked hard on education to secure as much funding as possible. She also said that the budget could have been completed on time had special interest been under control. Her next main point was jobs, jobs, jobs, and the regressive tax system on small businesses. To Jan, I say keep up the good work and stand for property rights, we pay the bills too.

Given the economy there has been a lot of cutting of programs and scrambling for money. The state may tell you they have cut the budget but don't be shocked about the many fees that will be imposed on you. It will cost you more for your drivers license and car tabs. Your telephone and electric bills will have additional fees and we haven't even added up how much the county has increased their fees. The State is suing to repeal the required 2/3 vote to pass additional taxes on the people. There must be a good reason the people passed it in the first place. What would property taxes be if we hadn't?

Is there an end to all of this? Yes, there is. When the property owner can no longer pay imposed taxes or the economical out fall from imposed hyper-regulation diminishes property values to such an excessive point, the property owner relinquish his property rights by selling dirt cheap, giving it back to the bank or loosing it through regulation imposed by our elected officials. Property owners need to stand and say NO. They need to write or email their Commissioners, Senators, and Representatives and they need to be present at as many meetings as they can and voice their opinions. If you are silent you will see no change and it will remain status quo or worse. **Find your voices, be heard loud and clear.**

Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners' critical area challenge scored several victories for homeowners

7/27/2011

By Brian T Hodges, Managing Attorney, Pacific Legal Foundation
and Jackie Rossworn, Executive Director, Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners

Earlier this month, Washington's Supreme Court declined to consider Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners' challenge to Kitsap County's critical areas ordinance (CAO). But to borrow from Mark Twain, reports of the County's victory in this case are greatly exaggerated. This 6-year appeal resulted in several decisions protecting the rights of homeowners. And even after the Supreme Court's decision, critical questions concerning the validity of the CAO remain.

KAPO's appeal questioned Kitsap County's justification for imposing a 100-foot buffer on fully-developed residential properties. Why should a permit to remodel a 50-year old shoreline home be subject to the same buffer restrictions as a permit to clear a fully-vegetated, undeveloped lot? Why should a home-including its garden, lawn, and swing set-be declared nonconforming simply because the County wants a big buffer? The County's science concluded that site-specific measures-*not buffers*-were the most effective way to protect critical areas because every parcel is different (different land uses, soil type, slope, vegetation, etc.). So why did Kitsap County adopt big, uniform buffers? Because, as the County explained, big buffers are easier to administer than the site-appropriate measures recommended by their science.

This made no sense to KAPO. So for 6 years, KAPO fought to have the CAO reviewed in a meaningful way. And during those years, KAPO scored important victories for the State's property owners.

Those who followed this case will recall that in 2009, the Court of Appeals ruled in favor of KAPO and invalidated the County's shoreline buffers. This decision was legislatively overturned. But in doing so, the Legislature put a stop to the County's decision to designate all existing homes and structures within its new, big buffers nonconforming, stating in an amendment to the Shoreline Management Act that existing shoreline homes "will not create a risk of degrading shoreline natural resources." Kitsap County, however, refused to strike its nonconforming use provisions from its CAO, so the Court of Appeals ruled that Kitsap cannot enforce those provisions against existing shoreline homes.

In another victory, KAPO successfully argued that CAOs must comply with State and Federal constitutional standards. This ruling seems elementary, but for years the County fought for a determination that environmental regulations are exempt from the constitution.

The County's proclamation that the Supreme Court's decision "puts to rest the validity of our Critical Areas Ordinance" is premature. The County knows that the central argument raised by KAPO's appeal - whether the CAO violated the same statutory requirements that resulted in invalidation of King County's CAO - was not addressed by the courts.

The County's litigation strategy was to avoid, not answer, this issue. And it worked. The Court of Appeals and Supreme Court declined to rule on this challenge, kicking the proverbial can down the road. This unresolved issue will arise every time the County requires a landowner to dedicate a significant portion of his or her land as a natural vegetation area in exchange for permit approval.

KAPO will continue to advocate for a balanced approach to environmental regulation that respects the rights of Kitsap County's homeowners.

Environmentalists Bad for the Environment By *Chris Grygiel*, Washington Policy Center

If an industry or technology is good for the environment, you can pretty much count on [Greenpeace](#) to be against it, a former leader of the group told a Seattle audience Thursday.

Patrick Moore, an early member of Greenpeace who went on to become a director of the organization before leaving in 1986, spoke at the [Washington Policy Center's annual Environmental Policy Conference](#). The WPC is a business-oriented think tank.

Moore described his path from Greenpeace stalwart - fighting hydrogen bomb testing and baby seal clubbing - to strident critic of his former mates and many others in the environmental movement. Moore, who earned a doctorate in ecology from the University of British Columbia, said his break began because he became convinced many environmentalists were scientific dummies.

"I found myself the only international director with any formal science education," Moore said. "We were starting to deal with really complex issues of chemistry and biology and genetics. You don't need a Ph.D. in nuclear physics to be against nuclear war. And you don't need a Ph.D. in marine biology to think that whales should be saved. But when you start talking about all the chemicals and substances that are used in all of our products and services we get...you need to know something about chemistry and biology."

He said he was aghast when Greenpeace was in favor a worldwide ban on chlorine, which is used to purify water.

"I said, 'You guys, that's one of the elements of the periodic table, **it's one of the building blocks of the universe**, I don't know if it's within our jurisdiction,'" Moore said. "Adding chlorine to drinking water was the **biggest advance** in the history of public health. It saved more lives than anything else we've ever done...It fell on deaf ears, I had to leave."

The Sierra Club and other environmentalists are too often reflexively opposed to things that are highly beneficial to the environment, Moore argued. Instead of being opposed to logging, hydroelectric dams and nuclear power, they should embrace these practices, he said. Trees are a **renewable** resource, excellent building material and are in many ways safer than steel and concrete for construction needs, he said. He spoke in favor of power generated by dams - "for some reason the hydroelectric energy in Washington state is not considered green" - and of using nuclear power, despite the high-profile attention to accidents in places like Chernobyl, Three Mile Island and most recently in Japan.

"Nuclear power produces 75 percent of the non fossil fuel energy in the United States," Moore said. If you get rid of nuclear power, as countries like Germany and now Japan are suggesting they will, he said the only practical way to make up the difference is to burn more fossil fuels, an anathema to environmentalists. Moore said alternative energies like solar and wind are not practical.

He was blisteringly critical of efforts against genetically modified crops, specifically the fight against so-called "**golden rice**," rice with scientifically added beta carotene, which Moore said helps impoverished peoples get sufficient Vitamin A. Without such nutrition, hundreds of thousands of poor children go blind each year, Moore said.

Greenpeace and others who fight such "Frankenfoods" do so **without any scientific evidence that they're harmful and ignore data showing their benefits**, according to Moore.

"It is all people who get their scientific information from the Lifestyle Section of the newspaper," Moore complained. Denying impoverished people healthy foods, "it seems to me, that is a crime against humanity." Moore also argued that concerns about global warming are overblown. "There's no cause for alarm," he said, adding the evidence that warming trends are due to people is not proven.

As you can expect, Moore, who now heads an environmental consultancy firm, **Greenspirit**, is harshly criticized by the crowd he used to run with. His opponents complain he makes money from the industries and technologies he now speaks favorably of.

The white-haired Canadian did have one positive thing to say about Greenpeace. He praised the organization's role in fighting global whaling, which he was a part of.

"No whale or dolphin should be killed or captured...they've got more computing power than we do," he said. "The best thing we did in Greenpeace...was to stop the mass slaughter of whales on the high seas."

To City Council Bainbridge Island

by Gary Tripp
Bainbridge Citizens Group

Bainbridge Island SMP Update

In the SMP update process, the city Staff has acted as a special interest lobby pushing one extreme point of view, RESTORATION of the shoreline to its original condition. The City Council should view with caution and great skepticism the policies, regulations, and legal and scientific justifications presented by staff.

Why do I say this:

1. Representatives from the primary stakeholder group (shoreline homeowners who have the most to lose) were outnumbered on all staff selected committees 2 to 1.
2. Decisions on prescriptive buffer sizes, bans on docks and prohibitions on repair or construction of bulkheads were already made before any problems with the shoreline were defined and before related science was considered.
3. Staff wrote all draft policies and regulations without meaningful input from citizens.
4. Discussions and decisions on the major issues (buffers, nonconforming status, law and science) were delayed until the last couple of Citizen Work Group meetings and then rushed through.

5. There was no attempt to balance private property rights and the need to protect the environment; and,
6. In the end the draft policies and regulations produced by staff are designed to remove human uses from the waterfront and RESTORE the shoreline to an idealized pre-settlement condition.

The goal of the SMA and Bainbridge's SMP is not Restoration, but the balancing of water dependent uses (single-family homes are a preferred water dependant use), private property rights, and protection of the environment.

Taking private property for the creation of an Open Space vegetation buffer between the property owners and the beach and Puget Sound they love is wrong.

There is no science showing normal low-density residential uses are causing any harm. The attempt to compare our developed shoreline with undeveloped shoreline is an attempt to make the SMP about restoration of the shoreline to a natural state. Restoration is not the goal of the SMP and is not required by any regulation.

Because staff has not been honest brokers in the process, disregarded shoreline property owners input in favor of their predetermined goals, and acted as a special interest lobbying group, the City Council should reject the policies and regulations and begin the process over again in an honest matter.

IMPACT STATEMENT: The first step should be to mail a statement of the potential impacts of the SMP update to every shoreline property owner. The Impact Statement should contain drawings and restrictions of the range of potential buffers, under what conditions (remodeling and rebuilding) these buffers will be imposed on existing residences, proposed restrictions on bulkheads, and bans on docks and floats.

Gary Tripp
Member of the Vegetation Citizens Work Group and
Director of Bainbridge Citizens
July 21, 2011

Bainbridge Citizens
Commonsense Environmental Regulations and Accountable Government
PO Box 11560
Bainbridge Is., WA 98110
206-383-2245

Results of Several Property Rights Cases. by Ken Sethney, [Bainbridge Shoreline Home Owners](#)

Swinomish Indian Tribes and Washington Environmental Council vs. Skagit County

The tribes and the WEC argued that Growth Management Act's Best Available Science requires mandatory buffers and the owners of existing farms must plant 200 ft buffers on all their streams. This would, of course, have put a lot of farmers out of business. In a Sep 17, 2007 9 to 1 decision (Susan Owens a former tribal lawyer dissented) - The Washington State Supreme Court said:

- Local governments may balance the numerous goals of the GMA and have broad discretion in developing regulations tailored to local circumstances.
- Local governments may consider local circumstances and justifiably depart from best available science (BAS) when local conditions show the need to do so.
- The requirement to "include BAS" means that it must be considered and the record must show that it was considered, but there is no mandate to follow exclusively what is suggested by BAS.
- The GMA requires a local government to "protect" environmental conditions, but does not require "enhancement" of those conditions.
- The GMA does not require local governments to establish mandatory riparian buffers.

Ray and Julie Biggers, et al vs. City of Bainbridge Island

The City of Bainbridge Island had imposed a moratorium on the development of private property in shoreline areas. They kept extending this moratorium over a period of several years. Several citizens filed suit saying they had been illegally denied permits for more than three years.

In an October 11, 2007 decision, the state Supreme Court agreed - affirming both the trial court and Court of Appeals decision. In the majority opinion Jim Johnson stated that there is no state statutory authority for the City's moratoria or for

their multiple extensions and that this usurpation of state powers by the local government disregards article 17, Section 1 of the State Constitution which expressly provides that shorelines are owned by the state, subject only to state regulation

Futurewise, et al vs. City of Anacortes, et al

The petitioners (city of Anacortes) argued that the authority to regulate shoreline critical areas has always been under the Shorelines Management Act and not under the Growth Management. In support of this, petitioners note that the Legislature passed an RCW, in 2003, that rejected a Growth Management Hearings Board decision allowing a local government to regulate shorelines under the GMA (prior to that hearing board decision, there was no legal authority to regulate shorelines under GMA). In a July 31, 2008 five to four decision, the Washington State Supreme Court held that the legislature meant what it said, Critical areas within the jurisdiction of the SMA are governed only by the SMA. On June 10, 2009 the state Supreme Court declined to reconsider their July 31, 2008 decision on Futurewise v. Anacortes. The Court action upheld their July 31, 2008 decision and reinstates a 2005 Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board decision interpreting a 2003 law (ESHB 1933) that amended the state Shoreline Management Act and Growth Management Acts.

Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights v. Sims

Citizens' Alliance for Property Rights challenged King County Ordinance 15053 that forced all rural area property owners seeking a clearing and grading permit to set aside 50-65% of their property as a "resource area." The purpose was to reduce sedimentation in streams and promote forest cover to protect and restore the environment. The set-aside requirement was automatically imposed on all rural lots, whether or not their development would have any effect on a stream or river environment. The trial court upheld the ordinance but the Court of Appeals, on July 7, 2008, unanimously concluded that because the set aside requirement was imposed in a uniform and present manner and without regard to the circumstances on the regulated lots, it violated State law. In August, 2008, King County filed a petition for review to the Washington State Supreme Court. On March 3, 2009, a panel of five Justices of the Washington State Supreme Court unanimously voted to deny the County's petition. The Court of Appeals decision stands.

Olympic Stewardship Foundation v. Jefferson County (12-587)

Pacific Legal Foundation substantially prevailed in their Growth Management appeal in a 51-page decision entered by the growth management hearings board on November 19, 2008. This case involved two main issues:

The growth board agreed with PLF that after two precedent-setting Supreme Court cases (Biggers and Futurewise) that shoreline areas may only be regulated under the shoreline management act, and not the Growth Management Act.

Regarding the adoption and regulation of channel migration zones as critical areas for the most part, the board agreed with PLF and found that the CMZ maps and several of the protection regulations failed to comply with the GMA. The board remanded the ordinance to the county to bring its regulations into compliance.

The board, however, concluded that the CMZ's potential future can be regulated as a critical area subject to the GMA, arguing that ample land should be set aside and protected for its potential future value as a critical area in the event that, at some future time, a river may change its course.

The result is that, in some areas, up to 4,000 feet of property on each side of a river, may be subject to no build zones.

This precedent, if allowed to stand, could easily be extended to include all property as being a potential future critical area. This theory flies in the face of the earlier decisions and is ripe for appeal.

Gold Star Resorts, Inc. v. Futurewise, No. 80810-4

Futurewise, an anti-growth organization, challenged Whatcom County's adoption of a comprehensive plan update that included several rural areas that were more intensely developed than those typically found in rural areas in its rural element. These areas of more intense development included existing resort and recreation areas, suburban enclaves, and transportation corridors.

Futurewise argued for a "bright-line" maximum rural density rule only allowing densities less than one dwelling per five acres in rural areas. The problem for Futurewise was that in Thurston County v. Western Wash. Growth Mgmt. Hearings Bd., 164 Wn.2d 329, 358 (2008), the State Supreme Court held that the Growth Boards lack authority to adopt and apply "bright-line" rules establishing maximum allowable densities. So, Futurewise adjusted its argument to try to skirt the Thurston County decision, arguing that the growth board decisions (that established the "bright-line" rules) should be considered as providing evidence that any density more intense than one dwelling per five acres is not urban in nature. The growth board entered a decision adopting Futurewise's argument, expressly disavowing that it was applying a "bright-line" rule. The Court of Appeals affirmed the growth board's decision. Whatcom County's attorney conceded that the

densities did not comply with the board's "bright-line" rule and gave up on the appeal, leaving the burden of defending existing development rights on one property owner who took the case to the state Supreme Court. In a 9-0 decision, the Supreme Court agreed with the property owner that the growth boards lack authority to establish "bright-line" density standards, and reversed the court of appeals and growth board decisions.

What Should Affordable Housing Be?

by Mike Gustavson, Director

The most effective thing we can do to get our economy moving and create real jobs is define GMA Goal 4: "**Affordable Housing**" as the median price of homes in each jurisdiction being no greater than 3.0 times median income in that jurisdiction.

Jurisdictions not meeting that factor would be immediately "Out of Compliance" with GMA and likely ineligible for State grants. This gets the immediate attention of elected, the electorate and unelected members of the Growth Management Hearings Board.

This definition of affordable housing ties home prices to current bank lending practices and quietly shines light on attempts at unsustainable "social engineering" regulation at the same time.

You will find this definition well documented in literally hundreds of writings by Wendell Cox and Randall O'Toole, with voluminous supporting data, showing the impact of excess regulation on housing prices.

It is easy to reflect on the seven regions on our country where housing prices were most outside the 3.0 range (California, Washington, Oregon, Arizona, Florida Wash, D.C. area and the Northeast). Buyers could no longer afford to buy in the 2002-2005 time frame because home prices were so high. Please note: median home prices were most pronounced where land use regulations were the most onerous (read this as "Smart Growth", "anti-sprawl" or GMA).

During that time frame Barney Frank and Chris Dodd rushed in with outrageous directions to banks to not look too closely at buyer's qualifications. Housing ratios reached as high as 12 times median income in some California cities. When the mortgage paper could no longer be re-sold, the financial markets all came apart and banks were forced to go back to historical lending rules. Housing markets crashed. Today, a huge percentage of mortgage holders are underwater or behind on their payments. The real unemployment rate is now in excess of 22% when all who have used up their 99 weeks of unemployment (and are "no longer looking for work") are counted. This puts further downward pressure on the housing market.

In Kitsap County median home prices should be in the range of \$150K to \$180K, yet we're still overpriced at about \$240K. This is the direct result of excess land use restrictions and having no numerical definition of "Affordable Housing" in GMA. I don't mean to blame only Barney Frank and Chris Dodd. "Making Homes Affordable" has been Federal policy under quite a string of administrations. Severe land use restrictions began in 1968 with the Santa Barbara oil spill and implementation of the California Coastal Commission restrictions. It has steadily grown from there until we now have a national economic disaster.

It's easily fixed by defining "Affordable Housing" as a function of median income.

PETITION

Below you will find a petition that will be submitted to Kitsap County Commissioners.

Please copy, sign, pass along and return to:

Contact : Doug Lyons
16255 Virginia Pt. Rd. NE
Poulsbo, WA. 98370
(360) 779-8871

dlyons123@aol.com

You must be a registered voter

We the undersigned are concerned about three elements of the proposed revision to the Shoreline Management Plan (SMP) for Kitsap County.

1. The provision that would designate existing homes as "**Non-Conforming Structures**" if they do not comply with the new setbacks and buffers.
2. Provisions that would **prevent** construction, repair, or maintenance of existing bulkheads to prevent erosion and protect structures.
3. **Mandating** the replacement of lawns and plantings with native plantings on existing waterfront.

WE WANT TO HAVE LANGUAGE ADDED TO THIS REVISION OF THE SMP TO GRANDFATHER (**EXEMPT**) EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY HOMES AND PROPERTY ON THE SHORELINE. THIS SHOULD ALSO ALLOW FOR MAINTENANCE, REPAIR, REMODELING, AND ADDITIONS AS NOW ALLOWED BY ZONING CODES.

Name	Address	Date

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 Jackie Rossworn 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 Jackie Rossworn, at 360-990-1088 or via email. rosswornjr@wavecable.com