

Annexation Task Force

July 9, 2008



Prepared for the City Council of Poulsbo, Washington.

To the Annexation Task Force:

Marilyn Miller
Kurt Nordberg
Bob Hawkinson
Jim Thayer
Bob Bergum
June Hensley
Dennis Brown
Shannon Stepan
Michael Chamberlin
Lynn Hopkins
Bruce Riggins

The City of Poulsbo wants to express it's appreciation for your hard work and dedication to this project. Your participation was informed, responsive and thorough. As Poulsbo grows and changes, annexations will continue. Your participation in this task force has helped the City understand the strengths and weaknesses of our annexation policy. Your insights will be used to make our policy better, so that annexation will benefit both the City of Poulsbo and the residents of the Urban Growth Areas.

Thank you,

Dale Rudolph, Councilmember, Chair Annexation Task Force
Becky Erickson, Councilmember

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY WITH POLICY QUESTIONS: 4

**ANNEXATION TASK FORCE PLAN OF ACTION: ORIGINAL SCOPING
DOCUMENT 8**

MEETING AGENDAS AND POLICY SUMMARIES: APRIL 21, 2008 11

MEETING AGENDAS AND POLICY SUMMARIES: APRIL 28, 2008 14

MEETING AGENDAS AND POLICY SUMMARIES: MAY 5, 2008 16

MEETING AGENDAS AND POLICY SUMMARIES: MAY 12, 2008 17

 THE ROUND TABLE SUMMARY: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS:18

TASK FORCE: MEMBER COMMENTS 35

 FROM MARILYN MILLER, A TASK FORCE MEMBER35

 FROM JUNE HENSLEY, A TASK FORCE MEMBER41

 FROM JAN WOLD, A NON TASK FORCE MEMBER42

 FROM JIM THAYER, A TASK FORCE MEMBER52

 FROM KURT NORDBERG, A TASK FORCE MEMBER52

 FROM BOB HAWKINSON, A TASK FORCE MEMBER56

 FROM JOHN AND MOLLY LEE, A NON TASK FORCE MEMBER57

 FROM SHANNON STEPAN, A TASK FORCE MEMBER58

APPENDIX A: TASK FORCE MINUTES 59

Annexation Task Force 2008

Executive Summary with Policy Questions:

The Annexation Task Force's first meeting occurred on April 21, 2008 with a mission to discuss and to develop suggested policy changes for the City of Poulsbo to consider when annexing new land into the City. This section of the Annexation Task Force Document summarizes policy questions that should be considered by the City Council.

1.) Notification of Annexation: a new process to improve communications.

Currently under state law, there is no systematic way in which people are notified prior to the City Council hearing the 60% petition, when annexation is occurring in their neighborhoods. The Task Force determined that improved public notice and overall communication through a neighborhood meeting would greatly reduce confusion and the spread of misinformation which increased levels of concerns for the residents of the areas that would be affected by the annexation.

The Task Force has come to consensus and recommends the following process to be implemented.

When petitioners come forward to seek annexation, they must gain approval of 10% of the annexed area to bring the petition forward to the City Council. When the petitioners gain the 10% approval, the Council will do the following: a.) it will define the area that must be notified by a map which will normally be the area of the entire UGA section that the annexation petition area is located in b.) The petitioners will be required to notify all the land owners of the area defined (as listed on the county assessor's tax rolls) by mail within 30 days of approval by the council. c.) the petitioners will also be required to pay for an ad in the local paper of record d.) The petitioners will be required to hold a community meeting and invite the people that have been notified within 60 days of Council approval. e.) at the community meeting the petitioners should explain to the attendees about the nature of the annexation they are proposing and disclose what plans they have developed for the land in annexed area. f.) there will be city staff available (either from the planning department or public works) to answer questions from the attendees during the community meeting.

Additionally, the City of Poulsbo should encourage Kitsap County to include in the County on-line parcel search, whether or not a parcel is within the Poulsbo UGA.

2.) Up zoning Land in the UGA: a fair policy uniformly applied throughout the City.

During the conversation regarding growth capacity, there were many questions surrounding the capacity of the land available for development and its ability to meet our growth targets. There was a general concern that if the City should find itself short of developable land, that as part of the solution to this problem there could be a tendency to put more dense development in the unincorporated UGA, because of a perceived lack of political consequence from that decision. Instead of up zoning the existing city neighborhoods (who vote), our growth targets would be achieved by

increasing densities in the UGA because the UGA residents would have no voice in that decision (they cannot vote). Although UGA zoning changes actually require joint approval by the City Council and County Commissioners, this policy would give some assurance to the UGA neighbors.

There was a consensus that there would be a fair and open process to include all the land in, and controlled by the City in the process of zoning changes and density allocation.

3.) Pre-application Conferences: a consultation regarding private property with observers in attendance.

The Council of Poulsbo supports and works toward an open and transparent operation by the City. Towards this end when there is a pre-application meeting (whether before or after annexation) to be held with the City staff, the public may attend. No formal notice of such meetings will be given, however the meetings are posted on the calendar and the public may see this calendar. The public must keep in mind these meetings are paid for by a developer and are informational in nature only. No public participation should be expected, except if requested by City staff or the developer paying the fees.

The Task Force has suggested that these pre-applications meeting might be more visible to the citizens if a list of the pre-application conferences be placed on the City website. It has also been suggested that a map be placed on the website that shows those properties that are proceeding towards development and have asked for a pre-application conference.

4.) Annexation Areas: how to annex larger areas at one time to achieve orderly development?

The Task Force acknowledged that larger areas, annexed all at one time, is a preferred option to better plan and implement infrastructure. Although this is a desired goal, there is also an acknowledgement that a "one size fits all" approach would not be effective in the annexation process. It was suggested that areas of annexation should be evaluated by their ability to promote orderly infrastructure development. If an annexation area does not promote orderly infrastructure development the area should not be annexed.

5.) Neighborhood Planning: a reasonable goal with obstacles that must be overcome.

The Task Force questioned the nature of neighborhood planning. How could planning be accomplished, how could it be paid for, will it be effective when directed at private properties under multiple ownerships? It was stated that there is little value for some property owners to be annexed into the city unless there was a plan for what will happen after annexation occurs. It was also stated that some neighborhood plans have little value in that after they are created, they are not implemented or cannot be enforced.

The Task Force is not in consensus as to how to achieve neighborhood planning, although all acknowledged that it is a reasonable goal. Some suggested approaches are that no development occurs in an area recently annexed until a neighborhood plan is adopted, that these plans would be developer driven and paid for, or the city would be responsible for paying for planning development. Such plans could also include exemptions for small developments and UGA areas. Neighborhood plans would address the development of infrastructure such as road and sewer placement but could include other neighborhood amenities.

Neighborhood planning in the UGA is an appropriate function for the City of Poulsbo. While it is true in the strictest sense that the UGA is within the county's jurisdiction and not the city's, it is also true that the county and the city has designated the UGA to be within the city's future jurisdiction and therefore the county's jurisdiction of the UGA is influenced by the city's policies and codes.

The City of Poulsbo is responsible to the city's residents to have the city develop in an orderly manner: orderly development cannot occur without planning. Also, planning to preserve significant open spaces and strategic natural features is essential to preserve the character and environment of Poulsbo. Limited neighborhood planning in the UGA to establish proposed, key transportation and sewer utilities in addition to open spaces preserving the natural environment is an appropriate and necessary city planning function. Also, this may encourage land owners in the UGA to favor annexation of their area and property since they will have a reasonable expectation of how future development will occur.

6.) Taxation: the burden of annexation

It is acknowledged that there could be increased taxation after annexation occurs. There are many factors that contribute to the increase in property taxes experienced after annexation including the size of the parcels annexed, the comparable values of recent sales, and the associated increased land values, and the proximity of wetland and critical areas.

The Task Force was not in consensus as to how to address the increased taxes faced by the recently annexed home owners. Some on the task force suggested that the County assessor should be encouraged to re-evaluate the land values after annexation, while other suggested a more direct approach of changes in zoning to alleviate the increased value. By changing the zoning of the recently annexed land to reflect that some property owners do not want to immediately develop, there could be a decrease in land value and the tax burden. Others believe that it would be inappropriate to use land zoning to address inequities in taxing policy.

The City of Poulsbo should take a leadership position in encouraging the County Assessor to work with the residences of the Poulsbo UGA and the recently annexed to evaluate and mitigate increased taxes due to annexation.

7.) Public Information: a new brochure and a Q&A (Questions and Answers) document for the public

The current draft annexation brochure needs to be re-written to reflect the new policy as adopted by the City Council. The current brochure does not have enough information nor has some misleading information as to the nature of annexation. Along with a new brochure, a subsidiary document that is a questions and answer sheet should be developed. This question and answer sheet should reflect the round table questions and answers that are incorporated in this document (please see Policy Section for May 12, 2008).

City of Poulsbo
Annexation Task Force Plan of Action: Original Scoping Document

Purpose:

At the City Council meeting of April 2, 2008, the Council rejected two proposed annexations, Gaines and Tibbets, in order to take a pause to develop an improved overall approach to guiding future annexations in the City, and in particular, annexations in the area west of Viking Avenue South.

This improved approach will address various issues related to annexation as identified by staff, developers, landowners and residents of the Poulsbo Urban Growth Area (UGA), including updated functional plans for utilities and roads, clarification and communication of sewer, water, pedestrian connectivity and road system connection policies, orderly annexation, communication of environmental resource protection policies and regulations, clarification of annexation versus development issues, and public education and outreach approaches for proposed annexations.

Plan of Action:

The plan for addressing annexation issues will be to establish an Annexation Task Force, consisting of UGA residents, land owners, developers, Council members, a Planning Commission member, and staff. Working Group members will be appointed by the Mayor, and meeting will be conducted in scheduled and publicly noticed working sessions, which will be open to the public. The Task Force will base their analysis on an annexation approach preliminary documentation provided by staff for each meeting/session. It is not expected that any new studies or additional outside research support work will be conducted for this effort. The product of the Task Force will be a document that clearly delineates the recommended annexation approach to be adopted by the City, including questions and key issues used in developing that recommended approach. A draft approach to annexation document will be presented in a City Council workshop, which will allow for a presentation by the Task Force, review and comment by citizens and UGA residents, and a period of public questions and answers, and an opportunity for public comment, prior to developing a final annexation approach document.

One element of the annexation approach document will be an "Annexation Fact and Myth" pamphlet, which will clarify taxation, utility connection and other related questions and issues. Concurrent with the actions of the Annexation Working Group will be the completion of the final draft utility functional plan updates, such that, the information from these updates will be able to be considered and included in the annexation approach document. It is expected that the functional plan updates will be completed in May-June 2008, allowing completion of the Task Force efforts by the end of June, 2008.

Scope/Outline for the Annexation Approach Document:

Purpose – as stated above

Background – including the Growth Management Act, Poulsbo Comprehensive Plan/Poulsbo Subarea Plan, general policies and background for implementing GMA and annexation, and a report on GMA/Comp Plan implementation. The question isn't "if annexation", but "when" and "how."

Functional Updates for Streets and Utilities – review of plan update status and issues that affect annexation. What are functional plans and how are they implemented?

Discussion of Annexation Issues:

1. *Clarification and communication of sewer and water system connection policies – hookup, standby and use fees, verses developers agreements, late comers agreements and local improvement districts (as relates to annexation vice development).*
2. *Road Infrastructures: understanding the capacity that is necessary and the difficulty of defining location. ROW questions: how are they resolved?*
3. *Orderly annexation, including how orderly annexation can enhance the City's ability to implement GMA goals and targets, including providing developable land and supporting infrastructure*
4. *Communication of existing environmental resource protection policies and regulations – Critical Areas Ordinance and Zoning Code affects, especially on the Johnson Creek Corridor*
5. *Clarification of annexation versus development issues – how does/should annexation affect development. Why do different levels of planning occur at different times?*
6. *Public education and outreach approaches for proposed annexations, including an "Annexation Fact and Myth" pamphlet, and expanded notifications and neighborhood meetings to inform and discuss pending annexations. The Task Force will decide to conduct a roundtable discussion with the Public to gather issues/concerns in preparation for the Public Education and Outreach session.*
7. *Final Annexation Approach Recommendations.*
8. *New or Changes to Annexation Policies*
9. *Improvements to Annexation Process*
10. *Specific Recommendations for Annexation of Area West of Viking Avenue South*

Recommended Plan of Action Milestones:

<i>Wednesday, April 9-20</i>	<i>Information Gathering and Working Group Membership Establishment (Notes 1 & 2, below)</i>
<i>Monday, April 21</i>	<i>Kick-off Meeting - Purpose of Annexation Task Force, Background, and Proposed Schedule; Review and Discussion of Functional Plan Updates and Policies for System Connections.</i>
<i>Monday, April 28</i>	<i>Discussion of Annexation Issues - Orderly Development and Environmental Protection</i>
<i>Monday, May 5</i>	<i>Discussion of Annexation Issues - Clarification of Annexation versus Development Issues</i>
<i>Monday, May 12</i>	<i>Conduct Roundtable with Public Regarding Issues/Concerns about Annexation</i>
<i>Monday, May 19 + 26</i>	<i>Public Education and Outreach Approaches</i>
<i>Monday, June 2</i>	<i>Annexation Approach Council Workshop</i>
<i>Monday, June 9</i>	<i>Review and Incorporation of Comments from Workshop</i>
<i>Monday, June 16 + 23</i>	<i>Final Annexation Approach Recommendations</i>

Note 1: The Mayor has invited UGA residents and landowners to submit written applications to be appointed to the Annexation Task Force by April 14, 2008, a total of 6 persons, 3 pro

and 3 opposed to annexation, representing the northern, central and southern portions of the west side UGA. The application will contain name, telephone number, and physical residence address, and whether pro or con, including reasons they should be included in the task force. Joint the Task Force will be two Council members and one Planning Commissioner.

Note 2: The Mayor has invited concerned residents and landowners to submit comments on this plan of action by April 14, 2008, and comments on issues/concerns on annexation for discussion at the proposed roundtable scheduled for May 12, 2008.

Meeting Agendas and Policy Summaries: April 21, 2008

Monday, April 21	<i>Kick-off Meeting - Purpose of Annexation Task Force, Background, and Proposed Schedule; Review and Discussion of Functional Plan Updates and Policies for System Connections.</i>
-------------------------	--

Proposed Agenda:

1. *Introductions, reasons for involvement, roles in the task force, document contact information and the responsibilities of involvement: commitment and resolution to work*
2. *Discuss Schedule: when, where and for how long; read ahead materials and homework.*
3. *Basic review of each scheduled meeting: quick snapshot of content*
4. *What is the purpose of the Task Force? Why are we here?*
 - a. *Review of Annexation History: why do we annex? Legal review and GMA*
 - b. *Review of recent Annexation History: Tibbet and Gaines and why now?*
 - c. *What are the questions that we need to answer?*
 - i. *Landowners?*
 - ii. *Developers?*
 - iii. *Residents?*
 - iv. *Council?*
5. *What are the functional plans? How do they fit into our Comprehensive Plan? Why are they necessary component of annexation policy? How are they implemented and how might the method affect annexation? What does "functional plan" mean and what does "conceptual planning" mean? What are the outstanding issues that might affect the annexation policy and what is the status of the plan completion/adoption?*
 - a. *Sewer*
 - b. *Water*
 - c. *Storm Water*
 - d. *Transportation Improvement Plan*
6. *Connectivity: connections (roads and pedestrian) of the functional plans. How does this occur, importance? What are the costs and what discretion does the City have?*

Policy Questions resolved: what levels of consensus has the task force developed?

Resource Tools:

[City of Poulsbo Annexation Documents](#)

[MSRC Annexation Handbook](#)

[Annexation Information: MSRC](#)

[Growth Management Act Information](#)

Policy Questions Monday, April 21	<i>Kick-off Meeting - Purpose of Annexation Task Force, Background, and Proposed Schedule; Review and Discussion of Functional Plan Updates and Policies for System Connections.</i>
--	--

Please see the Executive Summary for the finalized Policy Questions:

During the April 21 meeting, the following policy questions were explored:

- *The nature of concurrency: what does this mean for annexation? During the task force conversation, it became apparent that the concept of concurrency needs to be explored during the information phase of annexation. As annexations occur and development follows, when does the six (6) year window of concurrency open? Some in the task force were concerned that the 6 year period was too long. Development occurs and the road congestion is almost immediate from new homes going into the neighborhood. Finn Hill was an especially concerning road segment in that there is no other current way to get to and from highway 3. It was explained in the task force that the concurrency timing of 6 years is state law which the City of Poulsbo must enforce. But still many of the following questions remained.*

- *When does concurrency timing occur? Does it begin when we collect the first fee? Concurrency timing begins when we collect the first fee. The fees can only be held for improvements through the 6 year window. The city can ask to have the developer sign a release to hold the funds longer. At the present, the fees are collected at final plat. This becomes problematic when it is required to have multiple projects in order to completely fund a project.*

Fee collection for concurrency uses a tool developed through the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). SEPA requires that all impacts must be direct impacts or collection cannot be made. With the creation and adoption of a Concurrency Ordinance, (a requirement of the Growth Management Act) road impact fees can be collected for the entire community by a per trip charge.

- *What implication does this have with regards to our Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)? In fact, will our CIP with regards to road construction and improvement be driven by our mandate to enforce concurrency?*
- *If we have under estimated our impact fees in the past, what revenue source will we need to develop in order to make up that short fall? What implication does this have for future development in certain areas (Finn Hill) in the City?*

(Please note, the final two questions were not in the task force conversation but should be taken up by the City Council in discussion)

- *During our conversation it became apparent that developer pre-application conferences had occurred before annexation occurred. Some in the task force were surprised that the City would use staff resources to help plan and implement construction projects that were not within city limits. Others in the task force expressed their concern that when (if?) these conferences occur, there is an appearance that annexation is just one step in the development process. Others expressed their concern that when the projects are pre-planned before annexation, there is little time for the community to be involved in the planning process before the*

projects vest into our existing building codes. The task force felt that the following policy questions should be resolved:

- *Does the city routinely hold pre-application conferences for development of land that has not been annexed into the city? The planning staff of the City of Poulsbo does hold pre-application meetings as a courtesy to developers before annexation. The developer pays a fee to the City for the pre-application conferences.*
- *Are pre-application meetings open to the public? If they are open to the public, what role does the public maintain in the meetings? Pre-application conferences are not routinely open to the public. Because the developers pay a fee for the meeting, public involvement is rare. While the public can attend, there will be no notice that these meetings are taking place. If the public does attend, they should be aware that it is a meeting that someone is paying for and their attendance is considered a courtesy. The role of the public in pre-applications meetings will be non-participatory.*

Meeting Agendas and Policy Summaries: April 28, 2008

<i>Monday, April 28</i>	<i>Discussion of Annexation Issues - Orderly Development and Environmental Protection</i>
--------------------------------	---

Proposed Agenda:

- 1. What is orderly development and how does it occur?*
- 2. Why is orderly development important? How does it succeed? What factors make it successful?*
- 3. How is our growth target constructed? Are we meeting our growth targets?*
- 4. The Critical Area Ordinance: an overview and how it applies to West Poulsbo.*
- 5. What zoning affects occur after annexation?*
- 6. How does GMA (Growth Management Act) balance between growth (annexation) and the protection of the environment?*

Policy Questions resolved: what levels of consensus has the task force developed?

Resource Tools:

[Poulsbo Critical Area Ordinance](#)

Policy Questions Monday, April 28	<i>Discussion of Annexation Issues - Orderly Development and Environmental Protection</i>
--	---

During the April 28th meeting the following policy options were explored:

The Defining of Annexations Areas and Methodologies of Notification to Residents:

Please see the Executive Summary for the finalized Policy Questions

As the discussion of orderly development occurred it became apparent that some property owners that would have welcomed annexation were not contacted during the petition stage. Many others felt that they had virtually no advance notice of pending annexation within their neighborhoods. Even if they had advance knowledge of the annexation, there was not a consistent mythology for the neighborhood to receive notification and information surround pending annexations.

The task force concluded that the City Council should adopt the following policy regarding annexations.

When the petitioner approaches the City Council with a 10% petition, the City Council will insist on 3 things: (question for the task force: if the petitioner must gather 10%, must that 10% be of the entire contiguous area?)

- *The area subject to the annexation will be the entire contiguous area to the petitioner's property that is located in the urban growth area. (for example, the entire West Side of Poulsbo).*
- *The petitioner will contact everyone in that area by mail informing them of the propose annexation within 30 days of the City Council allowing the petition and;*
- *That there will be community meeting to be held within 60 days of the City Council granting the petitioners request.*

Protection of the UGA from Un-Equal Up zoning to Achieve Population Targets:

During the conversation regard growth capacity, there were many questions surrounding the capacity of the land available for development and its ability to meet our growth targets. There was a general concern that if the City should find itself short of developable land, that as part of the solution to this problem there could be a tendency to put more dense development in the UGA, because of a lack of political consequence from that decision. Instead of up zoning the existing city neighborhoods (who vote), our growth targets would be achieved by increasing densities in the UGA because the UGA residents would have no voice in that decision (they cannot vote).

The task force would encourage the City Council to adopt a policy the City will treat the zoning decision within the City and the UGA with equal care and concern. If change in zoning is necessary to achieve growth targets, those changes will be borne by a city wide process and not just concentrated in the UGA.

Meeting Agendas and Policy Summaries: May 5, 2008

Monday, May 5	<i>Discussion of Annexation Issues - Clarification of Annexation versus Development Issues</i>
----------------------	--

Proposed Agenda:

1. *Clarification and communication of sewer, water, roads: what are our connection policies and when should they be clarified?*
2. **When** *does planning occur? What level of granularity should planning take?*
3. *How can we plan for:*
 - i. *Road, water, sewer and trail connectivity*
 - ii. *Parks and other amenities*
 - iii. *Defining locations: why is this difficult?*
 - iv. *How do we define capacity necessary for infrastructure*
4. *How do we pay for planning?*
5. *How do we pay for comprehensive approaches to infrastructure? Local improvement districts (LID), late comers agreements, developers agreements*
6. *How do we address right of way questions?*
7. *Utilities: must newly annexed hook up?*
8. *Fees: use, standby and hookup.*

Policy Questions resolved: what levels of consensus has the task force developed?

Resource Tools:

[Poulsbo Local Improvement District](#)

[Planning and GMA](#)

Policy Questions Monday, May 5	<i>Discussion of Annexation Issues - Clarification of Annexation versus Development Issues</i>
---	--

No Policy Decisions were formulated during the May 5 meeting.

Meeting Agendas and Policy Summaries: May 12, 2008

Monday, May 12	<i>Conduct Roundtable with Public Regarding Issues/Concerns about Annexation</i>
-----------------------	--

Proposed Agenda:

What are the concerns and issues that need to be discussed?

Annexations: Facts and Myths: the development of a public handout: what needs to be included?

Resource Tools:

[Annexation Information Documents](#)

Policy Questions Monday, May 12	<i>Conduct Roundtable with Public Regarding Issues/Concerns about Annexation</i>
--	--

Please see the Executive Summary for the finalized Policy Questions

*The Round Table was attended by about 30 people that discussed the concept of annexation. Those in attendance were split into 3 groups to discuss and make comments on the concept of annexation; to explore their concerns and questions. Many questions were developed during these discussions and were delivered to the Staff of the City of Poulsbo for resolution. The rough draft notes of these discussions can be seen in **Appendix A** of this document.*

To more easily review the questions that needed resolution, the following chart was developed (thank you, Dale Rudolph). Each question was categorized in the following ways:

<i>Comment (only)</i>	C
<i>Comp Plan</i>	CP
<i>Environment</i>	E
<i>Growth Management Act</i>	GMA
<i>Infrastructure</i>	I
<i>Land Use</i>	LU
<i>Policy</i>	P
<i>Public Information</i>	PI
<i>Tax</i>	T

By sorting the questions by general content, we could more easily answer each in a systematic way. Additionally, it became apparent that the questions should be organized by over all themes: did the question apply to an annexation issue, a development issue or did it relate to

the ability to plan? These are the questions and answers that were developed by the staff of the City of Poulsville. The different text colors shows answers derived from Public Works (red) and the Planning Department (blue). Thank you to the staff for detailed answers to some very complex questions.

Importantly, many of these questions bring policy issues to the City Council for resolution. Suggested policy questions are identified by the yellow text in the left column of the chart.

The Round Table Summary: Questions and Answers:

Following are the three groups of questions sorted by a category.

1.) Annexation:

	Questions for Annexation Task Force (These questions appear to apply to ask/answer at the annexation time period.)	
INFRASTRUCTURE		
	(JL)Sewer Vs. Septic –	
4	What are the requirements for sewer connections? For new construction, a property inside the Poulsville city limit must connect to the sewer system unless the development is a single-family residence further than 200 feet from an existing sewer line, or unless the property is granted a variance by the City Council. Note: the use of a septic system requires approval by the County Health District.	
5 Policy Question	Does a property of an existing septic system have to hook up to sewer? If an existing septic system is properly functioning and maintained, the property does not have to hook up to sewer. However, if the property is within 200 feet of a sewer, a monthly sewer availability fee will be charged.	
6	Can a property owner install his own septic system within the city? A property inside the Poulsville city limit must connect to the sewer system unless the development is a single-family residence further than 200 feet from an existing sewer line, or unless the property is granted a variance by the City Council. Note: the use of a septic system requires approval by the County Health District.	I
7	What are the costs associated with sewer? On-site installation cost will vary depending on the development. Such cost is borne by the developer. In addition, there is a connection fee (currently \$ 5,430) for hooking up to the sewer system. Once connected to the sewer, Poulsville's monthly charge for sewer service inside the city limit is a base rate of \$30.41 plus \$4.00 per hundred cubic feet of water in excess of 400 cubic feet. For those relatively few properties outside the city limit connected to Poulsville's sewer, the base rate is \$45.36 plus \$5.94 per hundred cubic feet of water in excess of 400 cubic feet. Developed properties within 200 feet of an existing sewer but not connected to the sewer are charged a sewer availability fee of \$29.73 per month. Or 357.00 dollars per year	

<p>8</p>	<p>(JL)Municipal Water vs. Wells If we are in the city can we drill our own well? If a property is currently outside the city limit and is served by its own (private) well, the property may continue to use that well if the property is annexed into the City. If the property is then subdivided, however, the State Department of Ecology requires abandonment of the private well and connection to the municipal water system. Within the city limit it has been Poulsbo's practice to require all new development to hook up to the City's water system. From an economic standpoint, it is generally less expensive for the property owner to connect to the municipal water system than to drill a new well. Water hookup fees: Becky, For a single family home (one ERU – Equivalent Residential Unit) the City fees would be: 1) \$20 new account fee, 2) \$2179 General Facilities Fee (3/4" meter), and 3) either a \$115 inspection fee if the owner installs the service, or \$1500 connection/inspection fee if the City installs the service.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the property could be subject to either City front footage fees (if the City installed the main), or Latecomer's Fees (if a developer installed the main). These fees are variable based dimensions of the property.</p> <p>BL</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Do we have to connect to city water? See response above.</p>	
<p>10 Policy Question</p>	<p>(JL)Will the city ever use the Viewside Water System as part of its water infrastructure? No decision has been made. Ultimately the City Council will be involved in making this determination at some future date.</p>	<p>I</p>
	<p>(JL)RCW 36.70A.070.3e – Mandatory Elements (3) A capital facilities plan element consisting of: (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.</p>	<p>I</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Shouldn't the city hold off on annexing land if it does not have "probable funding"? Again, the comprehensive plan gives the opportunity to bring all elements of the plan into compliance; including funding.</p>	
	<p>Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson</p>	<p>Category</p>

<p>15 Policy Question</p>	<p><i>In the future, if the septic fails along the water front, this is not ok and might force annexation. Will failing septic "force" annexation? If there is a health need to extend sewers outside the city limit, the County requires a sewer availability statement from the City. Before granting such a statement, the City requires the properties in question to apply for annexation. If annexation is not possible, the City may make sewers available outside the city limit provided the benefitting properties agree to sign a no protest agreement to annexation in the future.</i></p>	<p>I</p>
<p>17</p>	<p><i>Standby fees: all fee structures needed to be checked and explained. We will be charged for fee for services that we don't use? Developed properties within 200 feet of an existing sewer but not connected to the sewer are charged a sewer availability fee of \$29.73 per month. \$357.00 per year</i></p>	<p>I</p>
<p>LAND USE</p>		
<p>1</p>	<p><i>(JL)How many animals (pets) can a property owner have? The number of animals (pets) is not regulated by the Planning Department. The Clerk's Department is in charge of pet licensing. Pursuant to PMC 6.02.060, no more than 5 dogs or cats or any combination thereof may be kept on any single-family residential property in the city of Poulsbo.</i></p>	<p>LU</p>
<p>2</p>	<p><i>(JL)How many livestock animals can a property owner have? (Horses, cows, chickens) Poulsbo allows agricultural uses pursuant to PMC Ch. 18.48.030, .220, and .230. Properties which meet these standards can continue agricultural use as a legal conforming use. If a property does not meet the referenced zoning standards, the agricultural use can continue as a legal, nonconforming use, which cannot be expanded to other areas of your property. Per PMC 18.48.030, no raising of livestock, poultry and small animals (other than household domestic animals), shall be conducted on residential lots less than 20,000 square feet in size. On parcels greater than 20,000 s.f. but less than 1 acre, the raising of livestock, poultry and small animals (other than household domestic animals) shall be permitted by a conditional use permit. On lots larger than one acre, the number of animals per 40,000 s.f. shall not exceed one large livestock or three small livestock and six small animals or twelve poultry. If no dwelling unit or occupied structure exists within 300 feet of the lot on which the animals are maintained, the above specifications may be exceeded by a factor of two.</i></p>	<p>LU</p>
<p>Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson</p>		
<p>3</p>	<p><i>Are land uses grandfathered? Such as farms? Existing land uses may continue either as legal conforming uses (if they meet the zoning code) or as legal nonconforming uses (see PMC 18.88).</i></p>	<p>LU</p>

<p>4 Policy Question</p>	<p><i>(JL)Can a property owner, of a larger parcel of land, build one single-family dwelling, as opposed to maximizing dwelling units the property zoning allows? What about out buildings, barns etc?4. Yes, a property owner can build a single-family dwelling on a larger parcel of land under the City’s current zoning regulations. Only when subdividing property would the zoning densities be required to be consistent with the zone. The use must be allowed in the zone and development regulations including setbacks and lot coverage will be reviewed for compliance. Outbuildings may be allowed if they meet these regulations. When subdividing, a property owner may develop a “parent lot” that is larger than the maximum lot size in the Residential Low zone, but it must be able to be further subdivided pursuant to PMC 18.16.040.A. Buildings or uses that do not conform with the PMC upon annexation may continue pursuant to PMC 18.88, Nonconforming Uses and Structures.</i></p>	<p>LU</p>
<p>POLICY</p>		
<p>1</p>	<p><i>(SJ) What if an individual land owner wants to annex into the city? Will small land owners will need to hire a developer or wait for a bigger group to pursue annexation? How much will it cost and how are costs shared by multiple petitioners? Annexation of a single property to the City is allowed. The requirement is that the property, or properties, be contiguous with city limits and not create an island of unincorporated lands. Recent direction of City Council is that an area proposed for annexation be reviewed by the annexation proponent for access and other infrastructure connectivity. The annexation proponent may be a private property owner or an individual with interest in the property such as a developer. City fees collected by Poulsbo for annexation are identified on the Planning Fees Worksheet which is periodically reviewed and approved by City Council. Currently fees collected by the City are \$200.00 with a notice of intent to annex; \$1,200.00 with a petition to annex; \$50.00 for the Boundary Review Board Notice of Intent; \$500.00 as a consultant deposit. Cost of publication and notice for an annexation will be billed to the annexation proponent. The annexation proponent will also spend additional monies not collected by the City for items such as preparation of a legal description. An annexation proponent may choose to pay all or divide costs associated with annexation between all property owners. The City will request a single representative be appointed for groups proposing annexation, and will send all correspondence and bills to the representative. this will change after policy adoption with increased fees due to the enhanced notification policy.</i></p>	<p>P</p>

<p>2 Policy Question</p>	<p>(SJ) Does the Tibbits annexation need to reapply for annexation? What are the fees? Yes, property owners in the Tibbits Annexation need to apply for annexation with the larger West Side Annexation as indicated by City Council in April. Staff does not have discretion to waive fees, therefore, at the time annexation which includes Tibbits Annexation properties is presented to the City for consideration a fee of \$200.00 will be collected. The Council may have the authority to waive the fees.</p>	<p>P</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>(JL) Can a “grandfathered use” property be sold to a new owner and have the “grandfathered use” still exist? Poulsbo Municipal Code Chapter 18.88 Non Conforming Uses and Structures govern grandfathered properties regardless of change of ownership. An existing non-conforming use may continue, when it is in compliance with PMC 18.88, under new ownership.</p>	<p>P</p>
<p>6 Policy Question</p>	<p>Richard Gaines: the utility agreement needs to be looked at very closely. Do we really need to do such large areas when just a few need utilities? The policy with regards to utilities needs to be looked at. How can the city grant utility agreements to just a few? The request appears to be that the city consider allowing UEAs for small properties which are not further sub dividable under current code.</p>	<p>P</p>
<p>PUBLIC INFORMATION</p>		
<p>1 Policy Question</p>	<p>Everyone seemed to agree that the current process of notification does not work/happen. What can we do about notification of the surrounding area of proposed annexations? Annexation petitions are noticed per the requirements of state law. Additional notification could occur, possible changes might include requiring a pre-application for a proposed annexation or requiring a Neighborhood Meeting. Changes in notification requirements will add costs to the annexation process. Currently, the process requires that the annexation proponent notify people near a proposed annexation. Signage is also posted on or near the property in 3 locations. Any changes to the current process would require amending Title 19 (permit application procedures) to add an annexation section, and Council approval.</p>	<p>PI</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>(SH) How is information from this annexation going to get to the people? See responses to #1 and #4 of this section. This is a proposed policy change: please see executive summary</p>	<p>PI</p>
<p>3</p>	<p>(JH) Can someone come to the city and get an annexation package? Something that will walk whomever through the process of annexing their land? The Planning Department can answer questions about annexation and provide the materials needed to start the annexation process. The Planning Department is also developing hand-out materials that will provide general information on annexation. There was request to develop a flow chart. Please also see the executive summary. After policy change, a flow chart would clarify the steps involved with annexation.</p>	<p>PI</p>

<p>4 Policy Question</p>	<p>(JH) Who will notify people in the surrounding area of the proposed annexation? The 300' notification does not happen. Currently, it is the annexation proponent (applicant) who is responsible for early notification. The City Planning Department sends out a letter to people within the proposed annexation boundaries after the City Council determines the boundaries during the authorization to circulate a petition stage of the annexation process. Annexation is exempt from the City's permit processing procedures found in Title 19 of the PMC.</p>	<p>PI</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>(SJ) Is there an annexation Guru? Is there a person with the city that knows and understands annexation? The Planning and Public Works Departments should be contacted with questions about annexation.</p>	<p>PI</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>(BH) What if we want better police service? Can we not annex into the city? There is a Mutual Aid Agreement between the City and County regarding service. When a call comes in from the UGA, the closest law enforcement unit responds, whether it is a County deputy or a City police officer. After the initial response, the County takes over any necessary follow-up in the UGA. In practice, it has never worked this way.(BH) This needs to be verified with the police chief.</p> <p>From: Howard Lemming Sent: Monday, June 23, 2008 9:22 PM To: Dennis Swiney Subject: RE: question from the Annexation Task force</p> <p>Hello,Just to clarify the statement below regarding Mutual Aid, there is no agreement to have the nearest Police agency respond to a call in the UGA. The area is unincorporated Kitsap County and all police calls are dispatched to the Sheriff's office as a matter of routine. Municipal police officers around Kitsap County do not respond to any calls outside the incorporated areas unless a specific set of circumstances develop. I have outlined these circumstances below. If another officer such as a Kitsap Sheriff's deputy requests back up at a call or if the call is of immediate threat to life/property, Poulsbo police officers can respond due to a state law allowing police authority outside our primary jurisdiction. (RCW 10.93.070). This law is limited in scope and does not cover routine police services. There are agreements between our agencies regarding special enforcement opportunities such as DUI enforcement programs or Seatbelt Emphasis patrols which may be where the reference to Mutual Aid comes from. Howard Leeming</p>	<p>PI</p>
	<p>Group #2....Notes taken by Dale Rudolph</p>	<p>Category</p>
	<p>There was considerable comment from XXXXXX, who was previously annexed into the City. XXXXXXXX felt she was misled by a number of parties that led her to originally support</p>	<p>PI</p>

	<p>annexation. She has issues with road ownership related to Marajeau Lane NW, but apparently this is between XXXXXXXXXI and other private parties. XXXXXXxX repeatedly reminded us that Viking Way is the proper name of the road from the South City Limits, and that Viking Avenue is only along the businesses. XXX owns 5.2 acres of land and has her own water and septic system, does not want to develop her property or get utility services from the City. Her taxes increased from \$1,500 to \$6,000 There are no questions to be resolved on this comment; however, a lesson could be learned that an improved public information process is needed to minimize confusion for future annexations.</p>	
7	<p>XXXXXXXXXX also discussed how significantly her property taxes had gone up after annexation. Please explain why this happens and what can be done to avoid it? Property taxes are set by the Kitsap County Assessor, and are based on current market value. If your property becomes more valuable as a result of annexation – for instance, if it can be subdivided once City utilities are available – it is possible that the tax amount will increase. However, if the market value does not increase, it is estimated that the tax rate would be approximately the same in the City as in the County. Kitsap County offers several tax relief and exemption programs. The Assessor came and spoke to the City Council on April 2, 2008, the meeting minutes from that Council meeting can be found on the City's website.</p>	PI
	<p>Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson</p>	Category
8	<p>Required disclosures are very important to the residents. The people that are buying in the UGA need to know that they are in the UGA and what that means. It is the responsibility of the potential property owner to do his or her due diligence prior to buying a piece of property. Any potential property buyer is always welcome to call and talk to the City Planning Department, who can look up the specific property and determine whether or not it is in the city limits, UGA, or County. City staff can also further explain what it means to be a part of the UGA. A purchaser's real estate agent should also be able to provide this information.</p>	PI
9	<p>The use of utility agreement were/are a surprise to many of the residents during annexation. See above regarding doing due diligence prior to purchasing property, if a utility extension agreement (UEA) exists on the property in question, this would be a part of a Title Report. Per state law, a title report is provided to every buyer after a purchase offer is accepted, and it is the property owner's responsibility to review the title report and understand the requirements of any agreements, easements, etc before closing the sale. The Planning Dept can always be contacted for more information on such requirements; in some cases, follow-up by the title company may be necessary. UEA's are under purview of the Public Works/Engineering Dept. In some cases a potential property purchaser may need to hire legal assistance.</p>	PI

10	<p>There needs to be better education of people. There are so many rumors that fly around and distort the process. Anyone with a question about a specific annexation or more general questions is welcome to call the City Planning Department. In addition, the Planning Department is developing brochures that will provide basic information on planning permits, including annexation.</p>	PI
11	<p>There needs to be a change in policy. Right now 60% can approve an annexation without notifying the rest of the neighborhood. Everyone should be notified. See responses to #1 and #4 of this section above. Any changes will need to be approved by Council.</p>	PI
TAX		
1	<p>(SJ) Can you put a hold on taxes when property is annexed into the city? With regard to “putting a hold on taxes” there are programs in existence through the Kitsap County Assessor’s Office to provide relief and/or exemption from tax increases. See their website: http://www.kitsapgov.com/assr/exempt/defer.htm. These include designation of property as open space, farm land, timber land, etc. and also there is a Senior Citizen & Disabled Persons Property Tax Deferral</p>	T
2	<p>(JL) Will County Current Use/Open Space/Timber/Agriculture Tax laws still be in affect when a property is annexed? Can one still use these tax advantages when they are in the City? Yes.</p>	T
3	<p>(JL) How will my property taxes be affected once my property is annexed into the city? Property taxes are set by the Kitsap County Assessor and are based on current market value. If your property becomes more valuable as a result of annexation, it is possible that the tax amount will increase. However, if the market value does not increase, it is estimated that the tax rate would be approximately the same in the City as in the County. The County Assessor provided a presentation on this topic to the City Council in April. The best information would be obtained from that office. See http://www.kitsapgov.com/assr/exempt/defer.htm.</p>	T
	<p>Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson</p>	Category
4	<p>4 houses per acre is defined as low density. How come people can build and ruin your view and yet you still have to pay the same amount of taxes even after you have lost your view? We do not currently have a view ordinance to prevent people with property in front of your view from fully utilizing their property rights as permitted in the zone. If the valuation of your property is over estimated based on view, you can petition the assessor’s office to reduce your valuation and taxes since you do not “own the view” or development rights of the adjacent property. You could consider talking with your neighbor about purchasing a view easement over a portion of your neighbor’s property (or purchasing their property outright, if available).</p>	T

5		T
	Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson	Category
	Protection and involvement by city government is important.	C
	Developer is part of the community, working to assure the neighborhood feelings and protections of the creek.	C
	Annexations are not a question of "if" but "when". It is really about who is going to do the annexations, not if it is going to happen.	C
	Growth has ruined Poulsbo. There does not appear to be any gains except layers of government and higher taxes. The private water system has been there since the '60's. They will not sell the water system to the city and will retain their own septic systems.	C
	There is negotiation for paving of private roads with the developers. The developers want to work with the property owners. They want to do it right. (John Johnson). In the pre-application process, they need to meet with property owners to makes sure what they are doing is the right thing.	C

2.) Development:

	Questions for Annexation Task Force (These questions appear to apply to ask/answer at the development time period.)	
COMP PLAN		
	Group #1	Category
1	(JL)Where does the liability for property/personal damage exist between critical areas/natural resource areas/larger natural undisturbed lands and urban development? (Open space corridors?) (Comp Plan Update Issue) (e.g. root or wind damage, erosion, etc.) Liability issues probably should be answered by the City Attorney and/or an insurance company and may depend on a written agreement such as homeowners association bylaws, etc.	CP
	Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson	Category
1	Salmon are now up to the culvert under Cedar Lane. There is a concern that massive development will affect the salmon. Can we be assured that they will be protected? Salmon habitat protection is addressed in the provisions of the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, which is applied through development conditions. Salmon are also protected under the federal Endangered Species Act; this is addressed through SEPA (State Environmental Policy Act) mitigation requirements. Other protection will be provided through development regulations.	EP

2	<p>There has been damage at the top of the creek. The creek is a valuable resource for the city and must be protected. The new storm water manual should help with that protection. The federal government requires the NPDES for class III cities and forces them to adopt higher standards. This does not appear to be a question --? Development will use the code that exists when development vests into the city.</p>	EP
INFRASTRUCTURE		
1	<p>(JG) The current infrastructure is taxed sewer, water, roads, etc. Who will pay for the upgrades to the infrastructure? Increased capacity to the existing infrastructure is paid in one of two ways: 1) by the City if the project is in the adopted Capital Improvement Program, or 2) by the developer if the project is not in the adopted Capital Improvement Program and/or if the developer wishes to increase capacity sooner than the City would do so through its Capital Improvement Program. To the extent a developer installs such capacity in excess of the demand generated by that development, it is possible for the developer to recoup this additional increment of cost by means of a latecomer agreement to be paid by future developments served by such capacity. Once a facility is deeded to the City, it becomes an asset of the City. Operation, maintenance, repair and replacement of that asset is then the City's responsibility and is funded through monthly charges to all users of the system.</p>	I
2	<p>(JL) Storm water Isn't storm water infrastructure, once developed and installed, become the responsibility and liability of the City? What happens when the "pre-development water flow standard" is violated? Does the city become responsible for the costs to bring such systems into compliance? If the facility serves exclusively private property, then maintenance and liability remain the responsibility of the private party(is). If the facility also serves public property (e.g., runoff from a public street), then maintenance and liability are the responsibility of the City. With regard to "violating" pre-development water flow standards, it should be remembered that such regulations are based on design standards not performance standards. In other words, if the development was built in accordance with the design standards in effect at the time of construction, then there is no violation if higher intensity storms create runoff in excess of the installed capacity.</p>	I
3	<p>Who pays for the damages caused by poorly executed, poorly planned storm water management systems. The engineer of record is responsible for the stormwater management system as approved.</p>	I
	<p>Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson</p>	Category
13	<p>Who pays for growth? Growth will pay for growth. If development occurs, the developer will pay for the infrastructure costs.</p>	I
14	<p>Who pays for water, sewers and roads? Developers pay for the infrastructure. You are not required to hook up to water or</p>	I

	sewer if you have functioning systems.	
POLICY		
3	<p>(JL)Does the city value larger pieces of land with forest, wetlands, streams and animals? What about the natural services these properties provide such as aquifer recharge, storm water management, oxygen, quality of life? What sort of protections will the city afford for those property owners choosing to conserve these resources? Protections for forest, wetlands, streams and habitat are provided through the Critical Areas Ordinance, in addition to critical aquifer recharge areas and geologically hazardous areas. Development regulations such as Planned Residential Development are also currently available to provide development opportunities that can provide areas for open space.</p> <p>There is no requirement to develop property within city limits. County tax programs are currently available for property owners who wish to reduce cost of property ownership.</p>	P
TAX		
	Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson	Category
4	<p>4 houses per acre is defined as low density. How come people can build and ruin your view and yet you still have to pay the same amount of taxes even after you have lost your view? We do not currently have a view ordinance to prevent people with property in front of your view from fully utilizing their property rights as permitted in the zone. If the valuation of your property is over estimated based on view, you can petition the assessor's office to reduce your valuation and taxes since you do not "own the view" or development rights of the adjacent property. You could consider talking with your neighbor about purchasing a view easement over a portion of your neighbor's property (or purchasing their property outright, if available).</p>	T
5	<p>New development means increased property value and increased taxes. New development can mean increased property value and increased taxes, If you do not believe your property value has increased you may petition the Assessor Office, as discussed above.</p>	T
	<p>Comment (only) Comp Plan Environment Growth Management Act Infrastructure Land Use Policy Public Information Tax</p>	<p>C CP E GMA I LU P PI T</p>
DUPLICATE	Group #2....Notes taken by Dale Rudolph	Category

<p>2 Policy Question</p>	<p>The question was raised – can you build a new house on a large lot in the UGA? Kitsap County allows for a “shadow plan” for how future houses could be developed to achieve the zoning density, the single house could be permitted. Councilman Rudolph indicated he believed that the City would require a short plat to sever the property such that construction would not preclude achieving future density. The question is - would the UGA follow the County or City procedures? Also, the requirement to short plat needs to be verified.</p> <p>Rudolph: Poulsbo Municipal Code Title 18 ZONING Chapter 18.16 LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT (RL DISTRICT) 18.16.040 Lot requirements.</p> <p>The following minimum lot requirements shall be met: A. Lot area: seven thousand five hundred square feet. There shall be a maximum density of five dwelling units per gross acre. There shall be a minimum density of four dwelling units per net acre. The maximum lot size shall be ten thousand eight hundred ninety square feet. A parent lot may remain larger than ten thousand eight hundred ninety square feet; however, it must be able to be further subdivided in seven thousand five hundred square foot increments.</p> <p>Councilman Rudolph’s response to this question is incorrect. GMA does not address single-family homes that will be built on existing lots. If someone applies to the Building Department for a permit to build a house on a 4-acre lot, it would be allowed under the City’s current zoning regulations. The City would not require the applicant to short-plate the property. [FYI – short plats in the unincorporated portion of the UGA are administered by the County, but are intended to meet City standards as provided in the interlocal agreement and the County code provisions for the Poulsbo Urban Transition Area (KCC 17.318).]</p>	<p>Duplicate</p>
---------------------------------	---	------------------

3.) Planning

	<p>Questions for Annexation Task Force (These questions appear to apply to ask/answer at the comprehensive planning time period.)</p>	
<p>COMP PLAN</p>		
<p>2 Policy Question</p>	<p>Group #1 (JL)Should existing property use take precedence over new property development? (Congruity & Interconnectivity) (Comp Plan Update Issue) (i.e. should City continue to allow and even plan for open space, agriculture, timber, etc.?) People are not forced to subdivide, develop or redevelop as a result of annexation or rezoning by the City. They can keep their property unchanged for as long as they wish, as a legal nonconforming use, provided the use does not lapse for more than 6 months. See PMC Chapter 18.88. The County</p>	<p>Category CP</p>

	<p><i>open space/timber/farming tax relief program provides temporary reservation of open space. This is typically taken out of the available developable land in the UGA calculations in both the City and the County (which is a policy issue the Council should discuss).</i></p> <p><i>As this relates to open space corridors, the comprehensive plan discussion will attempt to identify land that provides a reasonable opportunity to create open space and parks that link through our community. This primarily will consider critical areas (predominantly streams, wetlands and buffer areas) that cannot reasonably be developed for other uses. This is an easy opportunity for providing trails and linkages to developed parks. Non CAO encumbered park space and interconnecting links would be encouraged as development in the community proceeds. The intent is not to prevent or limit development, but rather to redirect it to more usable portion of the property, and recognize the restricted area as a community open space asset. The City recognizes that open space, whether public or privately owned, is a community asset in terms of providing wildlife corridors, protection of streams, wetlands, and water quality, etc. Yes, the City should plan for open space and parks, for the reasons mentioned above; and while agriculture and timber eventually may be phased out, it should not be disallowed. Potentially, open space preservation within a planned residential development could include a timber or farm parcel owned by the HOA and leased and maintained by a farm/timber operator. But the density of the developed land would need to be increased to meet the overall minimum gross density requirements for the zone. Key to the discussion will be providing policy and incentives for dedication of open space to the public, as the City cannot take land without compensation. Some provisions already exist; for example, the PRD ordinance provides increased density incentives for created dedicated open space within the plat, and the County program for open space exemptions/reductions of taxation encourages preservation of open space. If Poulsbo still considers itself a rural community, such open space preservation techniques may be key to upholding that policy decision, provided adequate development densities are provided elsewhere in the City/UGA.</i></p>	
<p>3 Policy Question</p>	<p><i>(JL)RCW 36.70A.160 - Identification of open space corridors – purchase authorized</i></p>	<p>CP</p>

	<p><i>Each county and city that is required or chooses to prepare a comprehensive land use plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall identify open space corridors within and between urban growth areas. They shall include lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas as defined in RCW 36.70A.030. Identification of a corridor under this section by a county or city shall not restrict the use or management of lands within the corridor for agricultural or forest purposes. Restrictions on the use or management of such lands for agricultural or forest purposes imposed after identification solely to maintain or enhance the value of such lands as a corridor may occur only if the county or city acquires sufficient interest to prevent development of the lands or to control the resource development of the lands. The requirement for acquisition of sufficient interest does not include those corridors regulated by the interstate commerce commission, under provisions of 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1247(d), 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1248, or 43 U.S.C. Sec. 912. Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to alter the authority of the state, or a county or city, to regulate land use activities.</i></p> <p><i>The City has not “identified open space corridors within and between urban growth areas”. Shouldn’t annexation be held off until overall comprehensive planning occurs-planning that is compliant within the GMA? The City will develop an open space corridor and parks element that shows how these spaces should be linked within the city and its UGA as part of the comprehensive plan amendment. It may be of benefit to complete the work before annexation is approved; however, annexation in itself does not create development, and designation of open space is more specifically determined with zoning regulation and development review. The open space plan amendment will provide general guidance, but actual delineation will be project specific and based on required open space, critical areas for each project and available incentives to add more open space.</i></p> <p><i>As indicated in RCW 36.70A.160, Restrictions on the use or management of such lands for agricultural or forest purposes imposed after identification solely to maintain or enhance the value of such lands as a corridor may occur only if the county or city acquire sufficient interest to prevent development of the lands or to control the resource development of the lands. This means the city must acquire (i.e. pay for) the development rights, otherwise it would be considered a “taking”. The land owner must be fairly compensated, either through purchase by the City, granting of development incentives, or other methods.</i></p>	
<p>4 Policy Question</p>	<p><i>Should the City allow temporary "downzoning", temporary zoning or a special zoning overlay to avoid the cost of increased land assessments by the Auditor on existing properties that don't "plan to develop"?</i></p>	<p>CP</p>

<p>5 Policy Question</p>	<p>Does the City allow continued tax exemptions (agriculture, conservation, etc.) and should the City allow future new tax exemptions? The City does allow continued tax exemptions (agriculture, conservation, etc.) and staff believes we should continue to as temporary land use classification. However, permanent dedications (of lands not encumbered by critical areas) should be permitted only where approved by Council and consistent with the Comprehensive Plan (open space plan), as this affects available developable land area could skew projected land capacity analyses. This would be a policy for council to consider.</p>	<p>CP</p>
<p>GMA</p>		<p>Category</p>
<p>1</p>	<p>(JL)RCW 36.70A.110. 3 – Comprehensive Plans – Urban Growth Areas (3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW 36.70A.350. Does this RCW apply to establishing UGAs only, or also to patterns of annexation? RCW 36.70A.110(3) applies only to the establishment of UGAs. RCW 35.13 addresses annexation by cities, but does not provide direction on which areas should be annexed first.</p>	<p>GMA</p>
	<p>Group #2....Notes taken by Dale Rudolph</p>	<p>Category</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>Lynn Hopkins started a general discussion of GMA growth requirements, which turned into a question of whether and how target population could be reduced for the City of Poulsbo. Councilman Rudolph indicated that target populations came from a process that involved the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council and a joint planning process with Kitsap County (revising the Poulsbo Subarea Plan), so reducing the target population would require the same process. Councilman Rudolph also explained that any reduced target population would have to be redistributed within the County, an might require forcing that target population on some other area, whereas, Kitsap County has already done the public process to establish the Poulsbo UGA and it would seem unlikely that they would want to go back through such a public process to move part of Poulsbo’s target population. Also, Mr. Rudolph indicated that the targeted growth for the Kitsap cities is clearly intended to keep the target growth in and around existing urban areas to minimize sprawl throughout Kitsap County. Verify this response Councilman Rudolph correctly states that it would be a complicated process to reduce the City’s population allocation. (The term “target population” is misleading, as it implies that the City is actively striving to reach a certain population number within the planning time period.) Kitsap County and the KRCC would have to agree to any amendment; the allocation cannot be reduced unilaterally. If the population allocation were reduced, the County comp</p>	<p>GMA</p>

	<i>plan requires that the population would have to be accommodated within another UGA (not in the rural areas), so agreement from one of the other cities might also be required.</i>	
	<i>Group #2....Notes taken by Dale Rudolph</i>	<i>Category</i>
5 Policy Question	<p><i>As a result of discussion of the proposed policy for requiring large, contiguous UGA parcel annexations, there was a question raised after this Roundtable Group broke up – how would this policy affect the properties encompassing the Viewside Watershed and the Viewside neighborhood, as well as, the small number of lots in between them? These properties are not technically contiguous to the rest of the west side UGA south of Finn Hill Road. Councilman Rudolph indicated that the Task Force has not actually discussed these properties, and that the merit a specific review and discussion, as the intent is to preserve the watershed and there seems to be no current obvious advantage in annexing the Viewside neighborhood, which is already developed and is not a barrier to any future development areas.</i></p> <p><i>Hawkinson: The dictionary defines “contiguous” as sharing a common boundary or touching. Washington annexation cases use the same definition – properties have to touch. I don’t see this word as meaning all properties which touch within a certain UGA area must be annexed all or nothing. At least some of us on the Task Force don’t share the position that annexations must be all or nothing. Perhaps we should revisit this subject.</i></p> <p><i>Currently annexation procedures are defined by the State RCWs. Annexation policies are being considered as a part of the Comprehensive Plan update process.</i></p>	<i>P</i>
	<p><i>Comment (only)</i></p> <p><i>Comp Plan</i></p> <p><i>Environment</i></p> <p><i>Growth Management Act</i></p> <p><i>Infrastructure</i></p> <p><i>Land Use</i></p> <p><i>Policy</i></p> <p><i>Public Information</i></p> <p><i>Tax</i></p>	<p><i>C</i></p> <p><i>CP</i></p> <p><i>E</i></p> <p><i>GMA</i></p> <p><i>I</i></p> <p><i>LU</i></p> <p><i>P</i></p> <p><i>PI</i></p> <p><i>T</i></p>
DUPLICATE	<i>Group #2....Notes taken by Dale Rudolph</i>	<i>Category</i>

1 Policy Question	<p><i>Molly Lee commented on the lack of diversity planned by the City. She believes that GMA intends for cities to plan to include diversity, including agriculture, livestock and timber. Councilman Rudolph explained that the City is required to plan for urban density, but the City Code allows for continuation of current uses, but not expansion. Molly asked if this right continued with the land (i.e. passed on to future land purchasers). Although Councilman Rudolph didn't think so, this will be confirmed with staff. Molly later asked a policy question – why annex more property before infilling the existing City Limits? Councilman Rudolph responded that annexation is change in jurisdiction, not development, however, conceded that this is a policy question that the City Council should address (should annexation be used to control/limit development)? Should there be a development related process to control the rate of development? Molly also asked whether the City would allow conservation easements like Kitsap County – such easements would be initiated by a private party, but would remove potentially developable property.</i></p>	Duplicate
	<p><i>The Growth Management Act does not address planning by cities for rural-type uses, including agriculture, livestock and timber. Cities are required to plan for urban land uses and densities. Rural-type uses which existed before annexation are allowed to continue (they may be legal conforming or legal nonconforming uses, depending on their nature and intensity) and run with the land, not the ownership – see PMC 18.88.020 for more information. Regarding conservation easements, an owner may record any type of easement they want on their property – this is a private party matter unless the land is dedicated to the City (e.g., for a park). If the primary purpose is tax reduction, the County Assessor already has various open space designations and exemptions for seniors, etc, that serve this purpose.</i></p>	

Task Force: Member Comments

From Marilyn Miller, A Task Force Member

Suggested additions or corrections to the Annexation Task Force recommendations

It has been argued that annexation is purely a function of change in jurisdiction that the change in valuation, and therefore property taxes is done by the county Assessor and should not be adjusted by changing the land use or zoning in this area. Because property within the County's jurisdiction has a different definition for low density residential as opposed to the City it is more of an issue than jurisdiction. The Council of Poulsbo does not want to place an undue burden on its' new citizens (by way of annexation), that have no desire to develop their properties nor use any of the utility services the City would offer. The Council will explore the land use or zoning for this area to better meet the needs of these new citizens, such as continuing the low density residential definition now used by the County until such time as the property is developed or the year 2025, whichever comes first. If this approach is not feasible the Council will find another approach to mitigate the unwarranted tax burden. The City's obligation is to have annexed the entire area by that date in an attempt to meet their growth obligation. There is no obligation for the area to have actually been developed.

The Council of Poulsbo wants to be sure that any and all new annexations will be done in such a manner as to consider the entire area that is impacted by this annexation and probable development. The current unwritten policy of development being done piecemeal will not be continued. The Council of Poulsbo should put in place as part of its' Comprehensive Plan a neighborhood (or subarea) plan for the Westside UGA that takes into account the area already identified as such as well as those lands that are west and adjacent to Hwy 3. It is not outside the realm of possibility this area could become open space and not necessarily residential, however the potential (or not) for traffic, etc should be looked at as well. If a developer was to step forward to pay for this subarea plan the cost could be divided up among those who wish to develop much as the "later comers" infrastructure agreement is used currently. Exactly how Johnson creek is going to be handled with regard to runoff, traffic, humans, etc should all be part of the subarea plan beyond the requirement of the CAO which only states what cannot happen, not what should happen.

From Dale Rudolph regarding the above statement:

- Public participation in pre-aps is limited to a very small number; therefore, an interest group should send a representative only.
- For Poulsbo UGA, there is not a difference in residential density between the UGA and the City; therefore, the second paragraph is meaningless!
- Planning for an area outside the City's jurisdiction is not a City responsibility and is not a reasonable request. It is unlikely these areas will be added or at least any significant portion for another 25years or more!

From Marilyn Miller: An Annexation Procedure Modified from the City of Bellingham

PROCEDURES FOR FILING PETITION FOR ANNEXATION

Owners of property and registered voters living within Poulsbo's Urban Growth Area (UGA) may petition the City Council to annex their land and/or residences, but are required to follow the procedures listed below. Filing a petition and application for annexation requires a variety of fees and a lengthy process, but does not guarantee that an annexation petition will be approved by the City Council.

It is very important for property owners and registered voters to understand that signing a petition for annexation is an acknowledgement that they are requesting that their property be

1. Assessed for City services, such as police, fire, library, museum, road maintenance, etc;
2. Assessed for existing City indebtedness, such as bonds, levys, and loans;
3. Regulated in compliance with the Poulsbo Municipal Code; and
4. Possibly responsible for infrastructure improvements as a condition of annexation.

This information must be displayed at the top of all petition forms. The signature of a property owner or registered voter will serve as a legal acknowledgement of this request to the City.

The Annexation Process

1. Pre-application Meeting with Planning Staff Required

Proponents of annexation need to meet with a long-range planner in the City Planning Department to discuss general annexation procedures, area-specific issues and details, and recommended acreage size and logical boundaries for proposed annexation areas. Generally, the City does not annex single parcels, but considers annexation of larger contiguous areas within the Poulsbo UGA. Planning staff will provide interested parties with forms, procedural requirements, and suggestions for holding a neighborhood meeting as described below.

2. Annexation Application and Notice of Intent to Annex

Once the neighborhood meeting has been conducted, proponents of annexation must provide:

1. A completed application for annexation;
2. Confirmation that the neighborhood meeting has been conducted;

3. A complete list of property owners in the proposed annexation area;
4. A map depicting the proposed annexation area;
5. A legal description of the proposed annexation boundaries;
6. A "Notice of Intent" form, available from the Planning Department, with signatures in favor of annexation representing owners of not less than 10% of the acreage.

3. City Council Meeting to Initiate the Annexation Process

Once an application for annexation has been determined to be complete, the Planning Department will send written notice to the City Council announcing the intention to commence annexation proceedings. Upon receipt of notification, the City Council is to set a date (within 60 days after the filing of the notice) for a public meeting to determine:

- A. Whether the City will accept, reject, or geographically modify the proposed annexation;
- B. Whether it will require the simultaneous adoption of a comprehensive plan, if such a plan has been prepared and filed as provided for in RCW 35.13.177 and 35.13.178;
- C. Whether it will require the assumption of all or any portion of existing City indebtedness by the area to be annexed; and
- D. Whether any specific infrastructure or improvements will be required as a condition of annexation to the City of Poulsbo.

The decision of the Council whether to "accept" the proposed annexation is entirely within the Council's discretion. By accepting the proposed annexation, the Council is not committing itself to ultimately annexing the territory proposed when a sufficient petition is presented to it. The decision to accept merely allows the annexation to go forward procedurally. If the Council rejects the proposed annexation, the initiating parties have no right of appeal.

4. Neighborhood Meeting to Explain Annexation Proposal

Proponents of annexation need to complete the following at their own expense:

1. Obtain a list of all property owners within the area from the Kitsap County Assessor;
2. Arrange and advertise a neighborhood meeting to discuss the proposed annexation;
3. Notification of the meeting must be mailed to all property owners and registered voters in the proposed annexation area at least 14 days prior to the date of the meeting.
4. Public notice of the meeting must be posted at a few highly visible locations within the proposed annexation area at least 30 days prior to the date of the

- meeting; and
5. Conduct a neighborhood meeting to discuss the proposed annexation (A City representative will be present to answer procedural and technical questions).

5. Legal Sufficiency of an Annexation Petition

If the City Council accepts the initial annexation proposal as supported by the notice of intent, the annexation proponents must then circulate a petition form to collect signatures of those in favor of annexation. In order to meet the legal sufficiency requirements, the petition must:

- A. Include a map of the annexation boundary and clearly state the specific conditions of annexation (as listed in 3. A. - D., above) at the top of the petition form;
- B. Be signed by the owners of not less than 60 % of the acreage
. If the proposed annexation area is not inhabited by residents, then only owners of not less than 10% of the acreage must sign the petition;
- C. Be forwarded to the Kitsap County Assessor. The Assessor will determine if the petition has legal sufficiency for property ownership and issue a Certificate of Sufficiency stating such; and
- D. Be forwarded to the Kitsap County Auditor. The Auditor will determine if the petition has legal sufficiency for registered voters and issue a Certificate of Sufficiency stating such.

5. Amendment of City-County Interlocal Agreement

Once legal sufficiency has been established, Planning Staff will schedule separate meeting dates with the Kitsap County Council and the Poulsbo City Council to approve a required amendment to the "City-County Interlocal Agreement Concerning Annexation and Development in the Poulsbo UGA." The required amendment must be approved by both Councils prior to the expiration of the 45-day review period for the Boundary Review Board, described below. Not sure that this is necessary. I think that by accepting the PMC, ordinances and indebtedness, that they would cover all ILA....but not sure.

6. Boundary Review Board

The City will file a Notice of Intention with the Boundary Review Board (BRB) within 180 days of first proposing the annexation, unless the petition fails to meet legal sufficiency requirements, as listed above. The notice is submitted to the Chief Clerk (BRB) and should contain the action sought, reasons for the proposed action, a legal description of the boundaries proposed to be altered, a county assessor's map and any additional information or maps requested by the Boundary Review Board. (RCW

36.93.090 and 36.93.130). The following actions are then taken by the Boundary Review Board:

- A. The Notice of Intention is filed by the Clerk. The Clerk reviews the Notice of Intention to determine legal sufficiency and when sufficient, assigns a filing date deemed and file number. The 45-day review period begins on the date it is filed by the Clerk. (RCW 36.93.090)
- B. The Clerk routes the Notice of Intention to agencies, municipalities, county departments, special purpose districts and interested citizens for review and comment. (RCW 36.93.093) not sure this is necessary either...
- C. The Notice of Intention is sent to Board members and Board Legal Counsel for review.
- D. The Board Chair may waive the 45-day review period by written statement if the proposed action is an annexation under ten acres and less than two million dollars in assessed valuation. The annexation then may proceed as proposed. (RCW 36.93.105)
- E. If the review period is not waived, the Boundary Review Board considers the proposal and determines if it will invoke jurisdiction (RCW 36.93.100), as described in section 9., below.
- F. If the 45-day review period elapses without the Board's jurisdiction being invoked, the proposed action is deemed approved. The initiator may then proceed to finalize the proposal under its pertinent laws. (RCW 36.93.100)

7 City Council Public Hearing

If approval is granted by the Kitsap County Boundary Review Board, the Poulsbo City Council will hold a public hearing on the annexation request to determine if it is in the City's best interest to annex the property. If approved the property is annexed to the City.

8. Effective Date of Annexation

The annexation, together with any provisions for the assumption of indebtedness, adoption of a comprehensive plan, and special annexation requirements, takes effect on the date set in the annexation ordinance.

9. Invocation of Boundary Review Board (BRB) Jurisdiction

A .If the BRB's jurisdiction can be invoked, as described in section 7.E., above, when:

1. any governmental unit or the county is affected; or

2. the Board receives a petition signed by five percent of the registered voters residing within the area which is being considered for the proposed action; or
 3. an owner or owners of property consisting of five percent of the assessed valuation within such area; or
 4. three members of the Board concur with a request for review when a petition requesting review is filed by five percent of the registered voters who deem themselves affected by the action and reside within one-quarter mile of the proposed action but not within the jurisdiction proposing the action; or
5. three members of the Board vote affirmatively to invoke jurisdiction except in the case of:
- a. an incorporation of a special purpose district or change in the boundary of any city, town, or special purposed district;
 - b. the extension of permanent water service outside of its existing corporate boundaries by a city, town, or special purpose district with water mains six inches or less in diameters; or
 - c. the extension of permanent sewer service outside of its existing corporate boundaries by a city, town, or special purpose district with sewer mains eight inches or less in diameter. (RCW 36.93.100)

The Board must act within 120 days of the review request, unless the Board and the annexation initiators agree to an extension. If no decision is made within 120 days and no extension is granted, the proposal is deemed approved.

- B. The Board sets the time, date and place of the public hearing. The Chief Clerk provides 30 days written notice to affected governmental units and municipalities within three miles of the proposal, places three legal advertisements in a newspaper of general circulation and posts notices in at least 10 locations in the proposed area. (RCW 36.93.160)
- C. A public hearing is held and a verbatim record is made of all testimony and the Board may direct the Chief Clerk to issue subpoenas to any person or agency for testimony or presentation of records. (RCW 36.93.160(4))
- D. The Board hears testimony from affected government units and individuals, closes the public testimony, and then reviews on the record the factors to be considered by the Board (RCW 36.93.170), the objectives of the Boundary Review Board (RCW 36.93.180) and the requirements of the State Environmental Protection Act (RCW 42.21 C and WAC 197-11) and the Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A). Based on the above, the Board may either approved, modify, or deny a proposal. (RCW 36.93.150)
- E. The Board then has 40 days from the final public hearing but not more than 120 days from the date that jurisdiction was invoked to file its written decision. The

written decision addresses the purposed, factors and objectives of the Boundary Review Board Law as well as SEPA considerations. It is filed with the County Commissioners and the clerk of each city or town within three miles of the proposal. Dissenting Board members may file a written minority opinion as a part of the written decisions. (RCW 36.93.160(4))

F. The Board's decision may be appealed to the Superior or Court within thirty days from the date the written decision is filed. The appeal is on the record which means that the Court reviews the exhibits, transcript and Board's written decision rather than conducting a new hearing. (RCW 36.93.160(5))

G. The Superior Court may affirm the decision of the Board, remand the case for further proceedings or reverse the Board's decision. The Superior Court decision may be appealed to the Court of Appeals or to the State Supreme Court (RCW 36.93.160(6))

From June Hensley, A Task Force Member

The role of this particular Task Force was to come up with some solid strategies/policies for the process of annexation. The notification process, larger scope of notification, and a detailed informational question and answer document will be, I believe, our most important contributions. However, it is clear that "annexation" is just the beginning of a much larger process that is truly at the heart of this whole issue.

It's clear that Poulsbo is going to go thru tremendous growing pains in the next ten or twenty years as we comply with growth mandated by outside forces. That growth can fit within a vision that the **City** and its **Citizens** are involved in creating or it can occur haphazardly as the winds of development dictate. We may be fortunate and have some developers that welcome public involvement and many projects, fortunately, may result in very complimentary outcomes to our unique community....then again, maybe not. My question to the council is this: Do you want to take a chance? I think this community has the heart, tenacity, and sheer will to maintain that same town feel that we all love so much....we just have to have the vision and planning to do that while adding another 7000 to our population. It may be extremely challenging, but NOT impossible. I urge the council to take the time to actually involve the public and plan for areas (i.e. neighborhood subarea plans similar to what Bremerton has done) . I don't have the answers for funding, which I realize is a major issue, but the cost of proper planning now will be far less than being disappointed with outcomes later.

Respectfully,

June Hensley

From Jan Wold, A Non Task Force Member

Annexation Assessment and Tax Information

June 26, 2008

Prepared by Jan Wold

Tax Process and Assessed Value Regarding Annexation

The Assessor's Office provided the following information on the telephone:

1. The levy or tax rate for Poulsbo for 2008 is \$8.92/thousand dollars of appraised value.
2. The levy or tax rate for Kitsap County is \$8.61/thousand dollars of appraised value.
3. Both the county and city can only raise their budgets by 1% per year in accord with Washington state law. The tax rate, or levy, is determined using the total city assessed value and the city budget with its 1% cap.

An exception to these rules is the case of either new construction or newly annexed properties, in which case the following rules apply:

- a. The first year a new home is built, the City of Poulsbo collects the first year tax above and beyond the 1% cap. The newly constructed home's assessed value is multiplied by the previous year's tax or levy rate to calculate the first year's tax.
- b. The second year a newly constructed house or newly annexed home is on the City tax rolls they are lumped in with all other homes and are under the 1% budget cap.
- c. In the case of a newly annexed home, the City of Poulsbo collects the first year's tax above and beyond the Poulsbo 1% budget cap. The second year process needs to be documented with Deb Booher.
- d. There are increased costs such as road maintenance, city support, schools, etc. that must be covered. This increased demand for services is not matched in tax collections for the city as long as inflation is above 1%. In cases where inflation is above 1% (and it always has been) the city has a higher demand for services and increasingly inadequate funds to cover the increased cost.
- e. In a case in which the county lands are annexed into the city, the county has a slight advantage, with lessened demand to maintain roads, for example, because the responsibility shifts to the city. The county budget cap remains at a 1% increase per year, but the demand for services drops slightly.

4. Property valuations for homes or acreage in the city's un-annexed UGA is valued the same as like property in the county. When property is annexed into the city, the assessed value is raised to 100% of the comparable values in the city. This usually occurs in one to two years. It makes no difference whether city sewer, water and garbage services or improved roads are available at the property. The following summarizes the changes in values and taxes according to my conversations with the Assessor's Office:

a. ¼ acre with or without a house is the same value for the land portion of the property in the county or city inasmuch as it cannot be further subdivided.

b. ½ acre in city has a tax of about \$150 higher than in the county per year. This can double if there is a view or waterfront.

c. 1 acre in City: \$151,000 X \$8.92/thousand = \$1,347.
1 acre in County: \$118,000 X 8.61/thousand = \$1,016.

\$331.

Increased taxes after annexation = \$331/year*

d. 2 ½ acres in City: \$219,000 X \$8.92/thousand = \$1,953.
2 ½ acres in County: \$155,000 X \$8.61/thousand = \$1,335.

\$618.

Increased taxes after annexation = \$618/year*

e. 4 acres in City: \$350,000 X \$8.92/thousand = \$3,122.
4 acres in County: \$173,000 X \$8.61/thousand = \$1,490.

\$1,632.

Increased taxes after annexation = \$1,632/year*

f. 5 acres in City: \$438,000 X \$8.92/thousand = \$3,907.
5 acres in County: \$186,000 X \$8.61/thousand = \$1,601.

\$2,306.

Increased taxes after annexation = \$2,306/year*

g. 10 acres in City: \$877,000 X 8.92/thousand = \$7,823.
10 acres in County: \$310,000 X 8.61/thousand = \$2,669.

\$5,154.

Increased taxes after annexation = \$5,154/year*

* If the property has a view or waterfront, the increased tax would be about twice this amount. For example, if a 4-acre parcel is annexed the taxes could be as high as \$3,264 in additional taxes per year. These amounts only include the taxes on the land. The amount of total tax also would include the tax based on the additional valuation of homes and buildings on the property.

Actual Tax and Assessed Value Changes Due to Annexation

Hard copies of the State of Washington Annexation Certificate with tax statements show the actual increases in assessed values and taxes after the properties along the west side of Viking Way were annexed into the City of Poulsbo in 2005. Some of

these land assessments increased nearly 800%! The land valuation on the tax rolls increased as follows:

Land Valuation of Several Properties

<u>Property</u>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<u>Year</u>							
2008	\$337,330	\$221,350	\$221,080	\$165,740	\$303,310	\$633,91	
\$493,860							
2005	<u>\$276,780</u>	<u>\$175,550</u>	<u>\$181,080</u>	<u>\$144,400</u>	<u>\$250,090</u>	<u>\$549,050</u>	
\$417,390							
valuation							
Increase:	<u>\$60,550</u>	<u>\$ 45,800</u>	<u>\$40,000</u>	<u>\$21,340</u>		<u>\$53,220</u>	
\$84,860	<u>\$76,470</u>						

X \$8.92/thousand

Tax							
Increase:	\$2,496	\$1,566		\$1,615	\$1,288	\$2,231	
\$4,898	\$3,723						

Conclusion: The owners of these properties are now paying from \$1,566 to \$4,898 more per year in taxes on only their land following annexation into the City of Poulsbo. In most cases, the assessed valuation of the dwellings on the properties also increased significantly, swelling the tax increase even more.

City of Poulsbo -- Land Use Designations and Densities

Prepared by Jan Wold, June 27, 2008

Multiple Family Projects

<u>Year Built</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Residents</u>
2002	Montclair Park Senior Living	109 units,
12/22/00	multi-family KCC HA , 19475 1 st Ave. NE,	16 units
		119 people

Total dwelling units: 16 units X 2.3 people/unit = 37
people

156 people

Total Multiple Family = 156 people

Housing Constructed During 2000 – 2008, but Subdivided Prior to 2000

<u>Type</u>	<u>Year of Permit</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Units</u>
single family home	09/15/06	NE Haugen St.	1
single family home	06/15/06	NE Haugen St. (Lot D)	1
single family home	08/14/06	Maranatha Lane	1
single family home	06/27/05	19998 Maranatha Lane	1
single family home	06/06/05	19996 Maranatha Lane	1
single family home	04/09/02	20064 Maranatha Lane	1
single family home	06/22/06	NE Lincoln	1
single family home	09/30/05	19905 Hamilton Ct. NE	1
single family home	07/08/05	Cedar Lane	1
single family home	07/20/05	18420 8 th Ave. NE	1
single family home	06/25/04	19152 4th Ave.	1
single family home	07/14/03	152 Peterson St. NE	1
single family home	12/12/02	20075 Pugh Rd. NE	1
single family home	08/28/02	18455 Torgenson Pl. NE	1
single family home	05/14/01	19823 Noll Rd.	1
single family home	10/30/00	18030 Fjord Dr. NE	1
single family home	08/10/00	20063 Pugh Rd.	1
single family home	08/10/00	20069 Pugh Rd.	1
single family home	03/30/00	18769 6 th NE	1
Cleaver Heights (1981)	05/29/02	1950 NE Ridgewood Ct.	1
Cleaver Short Plat	04/28/08	1983 NE Lauri Vei Loop	1
Cleaver Short Plat	08/24/06	Ridgewood Ct.	1
Cleaver Short Plat	08/15/06	Laurie Vei Loop	1
Cleaver Short Plat	04/15/03	1953 NE Laurie Vei Loop	1
Cleaver Short Plat	06/14/00	1980 NE Ridgewood Ct.	1
Forest Rock Hills	08/15/06	lot 81, 1230 NE Forest Rock	1
Forest Rock Hills	08/17/05	lot 48	1
Forest Rock Hills	06/28/05	lot 114	1
Forest Rock Hills	09/24/02	19988 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	12/27/01	20075 12 th Ave.	1
Forest Rock Hills	11/07/01	1388 Amber Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	07/25/01	1319 Lena Pl. NE	1

Forest Rock Hills	06/11/01	19864 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	06/29/01	19454 1 st Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/17/01	20038 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/10/01	19995 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/16/01	19741 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/16/01	19763 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/30/01	20024 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	12/29/00	19769 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	12/14/00	1264 Cameo Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	12/29/00	19873 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	11/28/00	19784 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	10/25/00	19876 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	09/25/00	20073 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	09/15/00	20043 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	09/14/00	19998 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	08/08/00	19764 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	08/09/00	1269 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	07/20/00	20065 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	07/21/00	20088 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	06/26/00	19866 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	06/16/00	19760 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/18/00	19833 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/23/00	19778 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/18/00	19781 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/18/00	19781 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/23/00	19776 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/18/00	1262 Cameo Ct. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	05/31/00	10883 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/13/00	20064 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/05/00	1386 Amber Ct.	1
Forest Rock Hills	04/25/00	19768 12 th Ave. NE	1
Forest Rock Hills	03/02/00	1395 Tourquoise Ct.	1
Forest Rock Hills	03/02/00	19788 Garnet Ct. NE	1
Havn Heights	07/19/06	Lot 28	1
Havn Heights	03/06/06	18561 NE Odin	1
Havn Heights	09/01/05	18535 Havn Ct.	1
Havn Heights	08/09/04	1217 NE Odin Ct.	1
Havn Heights	08/21/02	1379 NE Odin Ct.	1
Havn Heights	05/04/01	1238 NE Odin St.	1
Havn Heights	03/12/01	1220 NE Odin Ct.	1
Havn Heights	12/01/00	1442 NE Odin St.	1
Bryants Addition (1994)	09/15/04	18415 13 th Ave.	1
Bryants Addition (1994)	05/20/03	18542 13 th Ave.	1
Bryants Addition (1994)	07/03/02	18445 13 th Ave.	1
Wilderness View (1998)	10/02/03	1373 NE Gilmax Ln.	1
Wilderness View (1998)	01/25/01	1377 NE Gilmax Ln.	1
Terhune Short Plat (2003)	04/01/04	758 NE Haugen	1
Anderson SP (1994)	08/31/01	515 NE Matson	1
Anderson SP (1994)	04/07/01	501 NE Matson	1
Valhalla (1979)	04/06/00	18421 11 th Ave.	1
Deer Run	06/08/00	1916 Gustaf St.	1
Deer Run	06/15/00	18329 Miss Ellis Loop NE	1
Deer Run	05/19/00	18353 Miss Ellis Loop NE	1

Deer Run	04/25/00	1892 NE Gustaf St.	1
Deer Run	04/25/00	2014 NE Gustaf St.	1
Deer Run	03/01/00	2080 NE Selsund Ct.	1
Deer Run	03/03/00	1990 NE Gustaf St.	1
Deer Run	03/27/00	18311 Miss Ellis Loop NE	1
Deer Run	03/24/00	2167 Gustaf St.	1
Habitat for Humanity	07/17/06	18906 Noll Rd.	1
Poulsbo Comm. Church	11/26/03	751 NW Finn Hill	1
			93 units

Total dwelling units: 93 units X 2.3 people/unit = 214 people

Number of Lots or Units Created through Planning Permit Approval, 2000 – 2007 *

<u>Year Approved</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Gross Acres</u>	<u>Numbers of Lots/ Units Created</u>
2000	Ryan		3
2000	Cedarwood (portion of Snowberry?)		3
2000	Anderson		2
2001	Knight		2
2001	Rice Knutson		17
2002	Poulsbo Place	30.46	340
2002	Whitney's Glen Plat	6.67	29
2002	Larson Court	2.76	12
2003	Meredith Heights	26.22	74
2003	Alasund Meadows	11.11	40
2003	Olympic Ridge Condos	4.8	16
2004	Caldart Cottages PUD	4.18	20
2004	Verkilyst	0.51	2
2004	Schroder Short Plat	0.84	2
2004	Chateau Ridge PUD	12.30	46
2004	Noll Valley	14.08	44
2005	Cook Addition	18.20	90
	PUD (Johnson Creek)		
2005	Stendahl Ridge	41.42	185
2005	Vetter Homestead	23.36	93
2005	Carlson Short Plat	1.32	3
	(one of three lots can be further subdivided into two lots in the future)		
2005	Rindal Short Plat	1.03	2
	(one lot can be further subdivided into two lots in the future)		
2005	Leche Short Plat	0.75	4
2005	Gerhart Short Plat	0.71	2
	(one lot can be further subdivided into two lots in the future)		
2005	Snowberry Bungalows PUD	5.37	32
2005	Kimmel Short Plat (Noll Rd.)	1.06	4
2005	Bjorgen/Wells Short Plat	1.54	4
2005	Valhalla Village	2.89	20
2006	Vikings Landing PUD	5.94	18?
	(11/07 report shows 23 units, not 18)		
2006	Urdahl Meadows PUD	16.00	71

(Johnson Creek)			
2006	Sommerset PUD	22.51	128
2006	Peterson Street Short Plat	0.73	4
2006	Stimac Infill	0.41	2
2006	Caldart Heights	17.08	101
2006	Talon Glen	4.38	21
2006	Alness Marka	2.06	9
2006	Lone Pine	3.63	15
2007	Liberty Bay Landing Condos	1.95	27
2007	Hamilton Court Condos	1.03	10
2007	Boardwalk Infill	2.40	<u>10</u>
			1,507

<u>Year</u>	<u>No. Lots/Units</u>
2000	8
2001	19
2002	381
2003	130
2004	114
2005	439
2006	369
2007	<u>47</u>
	1,507

Total permitted dwelling units approved: 1,507 X 2.3 people/unit = 3,466 people



Projects Progressing Through the Planning Process for Approval

<u>Project Units</u>	<u>Gross Acres</u>	<u>Number of Dwelling</u>
Poulsbo Meadows PUD	9.18	46
Mountain Aire PRD	29.78	144
Blue Heron (9/06 document shows 119 units, not 84)	23.80	84?
Languanet (Peterson Place)	7.41	26
Poulsbo Place II (04/08 Planning document shows 340, Planning Dept. says 360. Result is 20 units more than 2002 permit (360-340).		20
Bright Haven Condos (Viking Ave)	4.68	64
Reinhart Short Plat	0.81	2
Rachel's Watch (21260Viking Ave.)	1.94	3
Powell Lot B (two-story condo?)	2.62	2+?
Powell Short Plat (two lots, 2831 Bond Road) Lot A		1?
Poulsbo Meadows		46
Torval Terrace Short Plat	1.66	2
Johnson Ridge – PRD (17504 Johnson Rd.)	18.61	80
RSR Townhomes		9
Nordic Heights PRD (Johnson Creek)	38.43	192
Angel Meadows PUD (Johnson Creek)	9.5	46
Fisher/Jordan Short Plat (2007 NE Lincoln)	1.01	4
Laura Lee Meadows plat		8
Chaffey Westerland Estates, Finn Hill, SE of Rhododendron (Johnson Cr. drainage) (Is this the same as Chaffey West?)	1.97	8
Sprouse short plat (may be condos or houses)		3
Almo site plan (business and residence)		1
Thompson short plat (19031 10 th Ave.)	1.25	4
Early ADU		1
First Avenue duplexes (at Bondwood Rd.)		6
Huang short plat (two lots, 5.59 acres commercial)		0
Torval Canyon Professional Building		?
Torval Terrace Short Plat: (apartments and condos), two lots	1.66	?
Olympic Silhouette (apartments changed to condos)		4
Alves ADU (18535 Haven Ct.) withdrawn		0
South Viking mixed use	?	?
Moore ADU (Bay St.)	?	1
Bazia ADU (18561 Haven Ct.)		1
Lobo ADU (20246 Cedar Ln.)		1
Johnson short plat		2
Cleveland Building site plan		0
Mesford Street PUD (another document shows 146 units)	18.36	101?
Cedar Point plat		18

Crystal Glen (10/07 report shows 48 units)	12.14	39?
Pool accessory dwelling and new residence		2
John Hart 18970 3 rd Ave.		?
(add two floors to commercial bldg. for three residences)		3
Eastman/Peach 20037 Bond Road		?
		<u>974</u>

Total units in planning process: 974 units X 2.3 people/unit = 2,240 people

Master Plan Approved, But No Plan to Proceed At This Time

<u>Project Units</u>	<u>Number of Dwelling</u>
Olhava	290

Total Master Planned dwelling units: 290 units X 2.3 people/unit = 667 people

<u>Preapplications</u>	<u>Acres</u>	
Vetter Road PUD (is this Vetter Homestead?)	23.17	117
Lincoln PUD	17.4	80
Plaza 305 site plan (business)		?
McMenamin site plan (19191 8 th Avenue commercial – out of compliance)		0
McConkey site plan (probably dropped)		?
Harbour Lights (condos and commercial, downtown)		10
Aho short plat infill		3
RSR Townhomes (40 parking spaces)		9+
Soccer Stadium: 30,500 sq. ft. + 308 parking spaces Finn Hill and Urdahl (Johnson Creek)	12.18	0
Owens short plat, 19521 Caldart, three lots, currently house on one lot	0.56	2
Kristensen short plat, 18209 9 th Ave., two lots, currently house on one lot	0.42	1
Hart commercial/residential (same as John Hart?)		0
Jefferies accessory dwelling unit		1
Skelley accessory dwelling units	3.94	1
Hanson Landing Industrial Park	4.97	?
Caffe Divano (business)		0
Milne PUD (18608) Noll Rd.)	10.2	18
Torgeson short plat	.05	1
Antonson Place Infill: 4 lots redeveloped to 10 lots; keep 2 existing homes.		8
Mesford Infill	2.4	12
Fernwood II: (6,960 sq. ft. commercial bldg.)	0.76	0
Creekside Bldg. (2,784 sq. ft. addition to office bldg. on 7 th Ave.)		0
Edwards short plat (Finn Hill and Olhava)	9.42	4
VanBleyenburgh 2-4-story condos (110,570 sq. ft., S. of 4 th Ave., next to Viking Crest condos)		35
Laura Lee Meadows (Alasund Meadows and Noll Road)	2.31	10

Viking Park condos (convert mobile home Park: Mesford and Caldart)	14.67	90
Tibbits – pre app. meeting held, not yet annexed)		<u>182</u>
		584

Total pre-application dwelling units: 584 units X 2.3 people/unit = 1,343 people

GRAND TOTAL: 8,086 people

This GRAND TOTAL is 992 people **MORE THAN** the entire GMA target of 7,094 additional people (Kitsap County Ordinance 403-2007, November 19, 2007, Appendix B.) for the 25 years ending in 2025. The population in Poulsbo in 2000 was 7,714. The County target distribution of population growth for Poulsbo by 2025 is 7,094 additional people for a total 2025 population of 14,808 people.

If one considers only the following:

- a. The houses already built during 2000-2007 (93 units, 214 people)
- b. Approved projects, many of which were built during 2000-2007 (1,507 units, 3,466 people)
- c. Multiple family units (156 people)

One arrives at a total of 3,836 people, 54% of the Poulsbo GMA target for 25 years. However, only 8 years of the 25-year target period (32%) has elapsed.

Numerous additional units are progressing through the planning process. These additional units accommodate another 974 people, raising the total to 4,810 people overall, or 68% of the 25-year target in only 32% of the target time. This is more than two times the development needed to meet the 25-year Growth Management Act target.

The Poulsbo City Council needs to revisit the propriety of this huge target, which originated during the early 1990's, and the heightened rate of development. The Poulsbo GMA target is six times that of Port Orchard's target! It is far higher than the UGA target for any other city in Kitsap County! The citizens who provided input at the Poulsbo Comprehensive Plan public meeting were deeply concerned about the rate and type of development occurring in their city.

* Sources: City of Poulsbo Planning Commission Summary of April 22, 2008 Report, pages 17-21, covering the period 2002 – 2007. The figures for 2000 and 2001 were taken from City of Poulsbo PUD, preliminary plat and short plat records (see pages 29, 34-35 and 55). Additional information was taken from the City Planning Application Status reports from January 2006 to May 2008 as well as the City of Poulsbo's map and list of all projects from the period 2004-2008.

Comments by Becky Erickson regarding Jan Wold's statement:

Please note, the above numbers have not been vetted by anyone on the staff of the City of Poulsbo. Ms. Wold's opinions do not necessary reflect the opinion of the Annexation Task Force or that of the City of Poulsbo. There is some concern that the numbers could be duplicated or recorded in error.

From Jim Thayer, A Task Force Member

The Annexation Task Force report to the City Council includes recommendations to (a) greatly improve the public awareness and understanding of the City's annexation process and (b) significant annexation policy questions and issues to be considered and hopefully acted upon by the Council. The recommendations are products of public input, much discussion, and the diverse viewpoints of the Task Force members: it is unlikely that further time and energy by the Task Force would have provided consensus on additional, significant annexation focused issues.

A few written statements to the Annexation Task Force have been received from the public and from one member of the task force stating that the notice to the public of the annexation roundtable forum for public input was not issued far enough in advance for the public to be able to attend the roundtable and provide input to the task force. The statements claim that the City did not keep its promise to notify everyone who came to the City Council's Tibbetts and Gaines annexation hearing on what is happening with annexation because the Task Force gave only 48 hours notice of the roundtable meeting, over the weekend. The statements claim this is a serious task force deficiency. This alleged deficiency is not true. What the statements to the task force are referring to was a reminder notice of the roundtable meeting. A very informative newspaper article on the formation and purpose of the City of Poulsbo Annexation Task Force was issued prior to the task force kick-off meeting on April 21. The article included the full schedule for the task force, including the May 12 public roundtable meeting. This was more than sufficient advance notice for anyone who wanted to attend the roundtable. Also, this was not the only means for the public to provide input to the Task Force: the public was invited to submit their comments and issues in writing or by email. Such submittals were received and discussed by the Task Force and the submittals are included in the report to the Council

From Kurt Nordberg, A Task Force Member

Poulsbo Annexation Task Force Questions for the Record

A. The Task Force needs to be able to review the final document and comment on it before it is presented to the City Council. It is not acceptable to have no final, comprehensive document from the Task Force. All we have is a series of individual comments and notes from meetings. The Task Force needs to have time to go through the draft document. The draft document needs to be cleaned up and then

returned to committee members for a final review. If there is a need for minority reports (and we hope there will not be), people need to have sufficient time to add them. Becky needs to be given enough time, or better yet some help, to pull the document all together. It is not fair to expect her to meet such short time frames with no assistance and no review from the Task Force.

B. There are errors in the pamphlet for citizens and the question and answer document. They are not finished, redundant and there are many omissions. They need to be presented as finished Task Force work. The Task Force needs to be able to review and discuss this work before they are given to the City Council.

C. Jeff Bauman was researching the processes other cities use for annexations. That should be reviewed by the Task Force, rather than completely reinventing the wheel. Where are Jeff's research findings? The Task Force needs to be able to discuss this information.

D. The Annexation Committee needs to get answers to the following questions from the Assessor's Office:

1. The Assessor's Office reports that the tax on properties going from the UGA to the City is increased on ½-acre parcels (\$150 approx.), but not ¼-acre parcels. We know that the taxes on five acres and a mobile home increased from \$1,500 to \$6,000 in two years. Someone needs to call the assessor to obtain tax increase amounts on one, two, three, etc. acres.

2. The assessor says the taxes do go up the full amount in 1-2 years. It does not increase in installments over a few years. There has been some confusion regarding this issue.

3. The first year a new house is built, or houses are annexed, the City gets all the new taxes above the 1% cap on the City's budget. After the first year the new property is just added to all other property within the City limits. The 1% cap is then in place. Does this mean that the City of Poulsbo has more infrastructure, traffic, police needs, etc. but no real new revenue to cover any of it? This process needs to be explained. It would appear that the City is actually worse off economically after annexing and new developments.

E. One City Council member said that any new developer will not be vested with the old stormwater regulations the minute they hold a pre-application meeting with City Planning. Others have said just the opposite. We need to be sure any new development in the Johnson Creek drainage operates under the new stormwater regulations that I believe start in August, 2009. Or can the City adopt the new stormwater regulations earlier? Other cities have apparently already adopted the new regulations.

F. The issue of vesting has not been discussed (see Seattle Times 06/11/2008 article).

G. The public with property in the Johnson Creek UGA near Liberty Bay probably think Tibbets and Gaines have nothing to do with them, yet Dale is back and forth on whether his "large, entire UGA annexation" would include them. No public involvement/notification. These people need to know what is being discussed.

H. The people (65+ homes) using (and probably owning) the Viewside Water System probably have no idea Dale is talking of annexing their water supply and the property surrounding it. No public involvement/notification.

I. All of the promises of notifying everyone who came to the Tibbetts & Gaines “non-hearing” about what is happening with annexation have not been kept. The City needs to notify people more than 48 hours (on a weekend in every case so far) in advance regarding the Annexation Committee, input and the workshop. The Committee should plan another public workshop with better advance notice to correct these deficiencies and to get feedback on the final proposals of the Task Force. This would give the people on the Viewside Water System and those in the UGA near Liberty Bay and Viking Way a chance to be heard.

J. I have been told by a reliable source that Poulsbo wanted the largest UGA target (6.41% -- six times Port Orchard’s UGA target) in Kitsap County. The City did not have to take that large a target. Bremerton (in the city limits) wanted more of the target for Kitsap County and already has lots of infrastructure available. Why not back out the Johnson Creek UGA and cooperate with Bremerton to take up the slack in a location that would infill with development where infrastructure is available and a salmon stream and estuary will not be destroyed?

K. The City of Poulsbo, in their own analysis, is approving development more than 2.2 times that required by the GMA target for 2025 (see Poulsbo report of 4/22/2008). This is probably 12 times that of Port Orchard. The density is almost double that of the minimum standard of four dwelling units/acre. At this rate the 25-year target will be met with approved projects in the first 11 ½ years or less. If all pre-application projects are approved, Master Planned development is undertaken and other residence construction are added to approved projects, the 2025 target is met now. There are in fact residences in the works for 800 people over the 2025 target. The task force needs to get a handle on this situation. We do not need to annex anything more at this time. There is plenty of time to prepare a neighborhood plan without any pressure from GMA targets. Inasmuch as the real estate markets are soft now, many people are having trouble selling their properties. Approving any additional annexations and subdivisions now will only exacerbate the problem. The lack of pressure to meet the GMA target would also allow time for the County to replace the inadequate culverts on Viking Way. These culverts are in danger of plugging and causing a total loss of Viking Way. They also are stopping anadromous fish passage.

L. The Annexation Workshop document still has the wrong information about why Mrs. Hagwell wants out of the City. She is happy with the Police Department. The document was supposed to show the tax increase amount; it still does not.

M. Given the densities provided by the City of Poulsbo to Jan Wold, the past projects developed and the projected projects currently in the works, the City of Poulsbo has reached their projected 2025 density projection **without** annexing the Johnson Creek Corridor. Assuming a buildout within the next 5 years, the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) falls short of projecting projects necessary for completing projected buildout currently on the books. The funding for the CIP will need to compress to fully realize buildout. What is projected is that the city is attempting to stretch out over 20 years, capital improvements which need to occur in 6 years. If the city is not able to find

- funding (thru rate increases borne by the tax-payers in Poulsbo) to improve its existing infrastructure, the City has no business annexing further properties in an attempt to “rob Peter to pay Paul”. The rape of the Johnson Creek Corridor by annexation to somehow increase the tax coffers to pay for capital deficiencies flies in the face of financial logic. Repair and upgrade what you currently have, have a regular and updated “pulse” on the buildout of the city, have a plan which the **Citizens, Taxpayers** and **Voters** agree upon, before the City willy-nilly cuts up a valid, functioning eco-system.
- N. Given the current lack of funding in the CIP for Sewer, and given the lack of availability of Water for the existing buildout, the GMA and the RCW requires the city to revisit and adjust their population allocation. We strongly encourage that the Johnson Creek Corridor density, zoning and appropriateness for urban development be revisited. I quote a comment from *The Sun*, June 15, 2008:

“Tim Gates, a regional planner with the state’s Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, said the idea that cities are unable to protect natural systems is an out-of-date notion. When it comes to natural resources, the courts effectively eliminated the old standard of putting at least four houses per acre in an urban growth area.

“It’s not like the GMA says urban growth areas are for people and nature must keep out,” Gates says, “Nothing in the GMA says cities equal pavement.”

In fact, local governments are required to have open spaces, he said. Some jurisdictions have protected large wildlife corridors.”

- O. Given the facts provided in Items M & N, we request that the parcels contained in the Johnson Creek Corridor currently not annexed into the City of Poulsbo be removed from the Urban Growth Area of Poulsbo and placed, as a Greenbelt, back into the County.

Comments:

- We appreciate the opportunity this task force has given the community to voice concerns about the annexation process.
- The energy that the task force was putting into this effort was very productive.
- The task force was coming to common ground on many of the issues, and that process was halted prematurely. A lot of time and hard work was spent by the task force members.
- “Get as much as you can get done tonight because this is it.” (Mayor Quade, at the June 23 meeting approx 6:45 PM)
- The citizens needed time to respond to the answers to their questions and they were not given that time.

Recommendations:

Based upon my communications with the neighborhood people I represent in this task force and based upon my conversations with other task force members, neighborhood planning should be performed **prior** to annexation

From Bob Hawkinson, A Task Force Member

For the reasons which follow, I have a couple suggestions for the Task Force:

- **Keep policies regarding neighborhood planning to a minimum in the forthcoming report** -- perhaps merely saying some level of neighborhood planning should be encouraged. If the City wants to go any deeper into this topic, this Task Force could be reconstituted to review this in greater detail or impanel another citizen group. We don't have enough information about this topic to make knowledgeable recommendations.

- **No recommendation the entire West Poulsbo UGA must be annexed all or nothing.** While there is nothing wrong with trying, if 60% cannot be obtained within a reasonable time, annexation petitions for lesser areas should be allowed and approved. As I understood it, a primary reason for denying the Tibbetts and Gaines Annexations was the City's desire of getting the entire West Poulsbo UGA annexed at one time, avoiding a situation where a sizable pocket of land in the central area (between Cedar Lane and Liberty Road) remains indefinitely under County jurisdiction. Based on discussions with neighbors in the central area, I knew going into the annexation study their biggest concerns are what development will look like (what's the plan?), do they have to hook up to sewer and water right away, and how will annexation affect their real estate taxes. I think the Task Force has done well with several policies and I learned some new things. However, I doubt we've made any significant progress towards getting at least 60% of the residents within the West Poulsbo UGA interested in signing an annexation petition. There is no incentive for residents who have no interest in developing their property in the near term and own a half an acre or more to sign a 60% petition. In fact, a significant tax increase will likely discourage many residents from signing. UGA residents see annexation as the first step in the development process, and they want to know how development will affect their property and lives. Personally, I favor some level of neighborhood planning, but I'm not sure what it ought to look like. I suspect the Task Force as a group does not have a unified vision for neighborhood planning. Is it large area, detailed plans like Bremerton? Or, is it a plan submitted by developer for a significant project? I'm not sure what should be considered "significant." I think it should be something more than a person building a house or two, but just where should the line be drawn? Unfortunately, neighborhood planning became a significant part of last Monday's meeting. The Task Force members are intelligent, and they jumped right in to solve problems as they individually see them. I'm concerned making policies without the proper understanding of what neighborhood planning is and isn't, can easily cause more harm than good. A couple of examples follow.

Requiring a Bremerton-style neighborhood plan prior to annexation could effectively be a moratorium on growth and development. I doubt many developers would gamble this kind of money without assurances the property will be brought into the City. Many developers no longer buy parcels outright to develop. They take options on them, with the option payment due during the permitting process.

If a neighborhood plan must encompass the entire West Poulsbo UGA before any portion can be developed, this too would likely result in a development moratorium. It would be too expensive for the small to medium-sized developer. Additionally, it would be a very difficult task for a developer to manage a process involving such a large area with at least three distinctive zones. I feel only the City could manage this, and it might take many years or never happen given budget considerations. It seems to me it would be workable to require developers to present an outline of their intentions at a neighborhood meeting and get input from the neighbors. This would be done earlier than it is currently. Components for the development outline could include where the streets and roads, water mains, sewer lines and storm water run-off facilities would be located and how they would tie into existing infrastructure. The outline could also include a general concept drawing of the proposed project. Developments often change during the approval process due to a number of factors, including demands by the City. Also, many projects are initially designed by developers who don't build projects themselves. They sell to others who complete the job, adding their own signature as to what the buildings look like (i.e., architectural design, materials, textures and colors).

From John and Molly Lee, A Non Task Force Member

Here are some questions we raise for consideration regarding the Annexation Task Force Plan of Action.

- 1> Why is this process just focused upon the unannexed West Side? Why not include all unannexed properties within the UGA of Poulsbo? If, ultimately, all properties within Poulsbo's UGA will be subjected to annexation and densification, why discriminate and exclude others in this process?
- 2> Why aren't the Viewside Water System and its 30 acre watershed at the SW Corner of the unannexed UGA being represented?
- 3> Regarding Item IV F of the Scope/Outline Public notification of this process and all future annexation proceedings. Adequate (not just legal) notification ought to occur to all affected landowners. Statements and concerns regarding inadequate public notification have been made in the past by land owners, council members, and citizens. How will the notification process be fixed in regards to this current proceeding?
- 4> It has been stated that the annexation task force is to include UGA residents, land owners & developers. Annexation is about property owners making informed decisions about **their** property. This annexation task force is not about developers making annexation decisions about other people's properties. The developers should not be crafting policy for the City of Poulsbo. If a developer owns property outright, then they have earned the right to participate as property owners. Any other participation is capricious

and arbitrary. By inclusion of a for-profit entity such as a land developer, the city is undergoing a comp plan amendment process and thereby being exclusive in its choice of participants. Please remove developers from this task force.

- 5> Readjustment of the Urban Growth Area (Contraction) should be mentioned along with urban reserve for future expansion – Item IV G of the Scope Outline.

From Shannon Stepan, A Task Force Member

It is my belief that neighborhood planning must occur before annexation can occur in a large UGA area such as Poulsbo's west side. This should mean including all those affected in a given UGA area and should include traffic plans, clustering options, open space planning, etc. Many property owners are concerned that annexation means an end to the lifestyle they chose, and allowing them to participate in a way that gives them input into how the area will ultimately look is a very important step. I am not convinced that developer-driven planning is the way, but I also do not have any ideas as to how to fund a city-driven plan. I don't think that neighborhood planning would necessarily be beneficial in smaller UGA areas, but it should be presented as an option.

I am extremely concerned about the future health of Johnson Creek. It is quite apparent that the health of Puget Sound depends on the health of the creeks that feed into it. Damaging even one small contributor to salmon habitat is a huge step in the wrong direction. It has been occurring everywhere, not just in Poulsbo, and given the recent efforts to bring Puget Sound back to health, it seems apparent and possible that Poulsbo can do more than provide a 150 foot buffer on either side of the creek. It needs to be carefully monitored during any potential development process, and continually monitored and cared for in the future. If and when development does occur on the west side, it needs to be done with the utmost care. Anything less is short-sighted and serves only those who stand to profit monetarily.

Much more needs to be done with respect to how annexation affects property taxes and the City of Poulsbo needs to be honest and forthcoming to property owners about what this means. If changes can be made in how one-half acre and larger properties are affected by increased property values and taxation, it needs to be done before any future annexation occurs so that property owners are not forced to sell because they can no longer afford the taxes. If annexation means nothing but higher property taxes, hookup fees, more traffic, and more houses, there is no benefit to those who do not stand to profit from development. It will be very difficult to convince people that annexation is a positive step.

Notification of public forums, such as public hearings, neighborhood meetings, and workshops regarding annexation needs to be done in a much more effective manner than has been done in the past. Posting a notice in a Saturday paper for a meeting the following Monday is simply not effective and is in fact, a disservice to the community.

Appendix A: Task Force Minutes

Meeting #1

Annexation task force meeting April 21, 2008

Dale Rudolph gives welcome:

Introductions:

Kurt Nordberg: lifelong resident...represent the people that don't have a voice (KN)

Shannon Stepan: people need a voice (SS)

Bob Hockinson: lifelong resident, people in the UGA don't have a voice in the use of their property (BH)

Lynn Hopkins: concerned about ramification of development (LH)

Dale Rudolph: City Council (DR)

Jim Thayer: planning commission representative (JT)

Dennis Brown: want to come up with viable and concrete method for annexations (DB)

June Hensley (co chair with Bob Begum): worried about annexation and growth without vision (JH)

Becky Erickson: City Council (BE)

Michael Chamberlin: interested in how the process works (MC)

Marilynn Miller: make sure that everyone has a voice in process (MM)

Mayor Quade: appreciation for those that want to work cooperative in finding solutions. Many thanks to all those that are involved.

DR: schedule shows 10 weeks, but we could move faster. There are 3 primary places where we are going to have public comment and concerns, comments by emails are welcome, we will hold a round table on May 12 where the public can talk to the task force, and then the council work shop on June 2 which will allow more dialogue. Please use the City website, with a link for all documents. Hopefully everything will be on the website by Friday.

DR: the city is not entirely satisfied by the process that we have been going through: We want to leverage so that we bring more in to the city. Generally, the boundary of the annexation is defined by those that want in, plus those that are "islands". But this is getting harder to do...and if we continue this pattern we will have significant problems annexing in the rest of the UGA and even the ability to provide utilities. Explanation of the map and the UGA plan and the definition of the subarea: we must go forward with our goal to ultimately annex out to the UGA lines. The largest portion is on the west side, but there are other portions around the city.

DR: we went through a long and rigorous process to establish the UGA with the county. This was a very contentious process between the city and the county. Biggest point of contention was the wet land at the end of Dog Fish creek. The other area was on the west side of Finn Hill Road. Either side of Rude road was very

contentious. Any questions from the task force about the back ground of how the UGAs were established? No questions.

DR: Improvements to the process in annexation. One improvement that is necessary is better communication about the annexation. We mandated community meeting for development. We will need to have better communications for annexations.

DR: plan is to come to consensus as we discuss this process.

BE: as we headed towards consensus, people could include a minority report.

DR: we might not come to consensus, and we will not keep hammering and hammering. We will allow a minority opinion to be forwarded on to the council. Hopefully we will agree on the facts. The most contentious thing could probably be timing. When will annexation occur? Annexation should all be done at one time. The city can initiate an annexation, but normally we use the petition method for annexation.

DR: Functional plans: sewer, water, storm and streets. Each functional plan is a different state of completion.

MM: what do we mean by transportation improvement plan?

DR: specific term that is a table of projects that have come out of the comprehensive plan. It is a list of plans.

MM: is it buses?

DR: no, it is a list of projects, road improvements and expansion.

BE: the transportation improvement plan was adopted about 1 year ago and it is on the city website. WE are trying to bet all the functional plans on the website. The functional plans are huge.

DR: all of the functional plans are for the city and the UGA.

MC: these requirements are from the growth management act? Yes.

DR: transportation is a little different because we updated the fees.

DR: The growth management plan was passed in 1990 and we adopted our comprehensive plan in 1994. The plans were updated in 2002 when we did are subarea plan.

JT: what is a subarea plan?

DR: it is a specific plan that updated our comp plan and the functional plans at the stage they were at in 2002.

DR: the primary purpose of the subarea plan was to define the UGA boundary. The primary purpose of the comprehensive plan is to grow the city into the UGA boundaries. The comprehensive plan will implement the subarea plan.

?: does the state have to be aware of our comprehensive plan?

DR: the state must approve our comprehensive plan and all our functional plans. Background on water rights and comprehensive plans. Water is very hard. And the law goes way back and makes it very difficult to get new water rights. The City is trying to get the maximum out of our wells, convert our surface water rights. Water is all about "rights". And working the PUD (Public Utility District). GMA has required growth to be in the city, but has not given the city ways to get water. Very difficult situation. Cooperative arrangements are being established with the PUD.

BH: who and what is the PUD.

DR: the PUD is a junior taxing district. There is a coming meeting with the PUD regarding water issues.

JT: they are not part of the county?

DR: they are governed by their own board.

JT: so the sewer plan is approved by the Dept of Ecology?

DR: they are all related and all are approved by the state. The only new piece left in the sewer plan is a sign off by Ecology and the financing plan. This is ongoing with the consultant right now.

DR: funding sources for the functional plans. Developer's agreement, the city could invest, or by a local improvement district are the 3 ways that these can be funded. Pretty rare to see a LID outside the commercial property areas. LID's are alleged to cost more, private partnerships are cheaper if they work but sometimes the partnerships can fall apart. The city uses grants and matching funds.

BE: does everyone understand why the functional is included in the annexation conversation?

DR: why would we extend utilities out to the county? Technically we can go out to the UGA to extend utilities but this is rare. This is done to failing systems or for health reasons. Utilities extension agreements do not promote annexation and our policy now is that we do not do it unless it is health reason. Even though people sign utility agreements and get the benefits they tend to be angry when the city exercises its option to annex.

LH: when was the last utility agreement done by the city?

DR: I don't know but we only do this on an emergency situation. We don't extend service to anyone. We don't have the money. Rate study, the only place money comes from is connection fees or rate payers. We don't make rate payers pay for growth. Growth pays for growth. How can you pay for that capital infrastructure? What is SEPA? State environmental policy act....it allows the city to impose impact fees.

DR: every development is subject to SEPA.

MC: when does this environmental check occur?

DR: prior to the development process.

DR: the county agreed that they would treat the UGA with the city policies. Commissioner Bauer has talked about doing the planning process in the UGA. But this interpretation should be done by the city and not the county. Our basic policy is that we do not plan in the county. We have done functional plans but that is the level of planning that adequate for annexation.

JH: this is part of the concern, so it is the lack of control of over development. How much control does the city have in a broader vision, but depending on the developer...at what does city of have control over?

BE: this is the point where Dale and I have different ideas.

DR: you a lot of discretion on your own property. Here is where our conceptual idea of where a road goes, but we don't have easements to do this...just as an example. How do we do this planning? We do have policies, such as standards, sizes, etc. We do have two points of access, egress and connectivity.

BE: what people really care about is planning but after annexation.

BH: it is really the chicken and egg situation and if we don't like what you are doing we can't even run against you. Annexation must come first. Access is much better in the city than in the county. There needs to be another layer between annexation and development...maybe there needs to be buffer? We are all in a well established neighborhood, maybe a neighborhood association?

BE: so annex then put it into another category for awhile?

BH: Gaines annexation was not that quick to go into development. There has to be some way to annex then plan.

DR: We are going to talk a lot more about development. You can have more detailed planning, who is going to pay for it and who is going to follow it? These new developments must use our codes. How do you control land that you don't own?

JH: you do go into certain communities that have a look to them. Like Stendahl Ridge is a concern and something we don't want. What are your rules?

DR: we completely changed to new regulations....

BH: we need to complete the information flow to the annexations.

LH: when Dec 2 and 3 hit there was a lot of flooding. A part of this annexation will be along Johnson Creek. We really need to be good stewards. The water table issue is a serious deal on that hill side. This needs to be in the back of our minds. The storm water issue is another big issue. Big trees hold a lot of ground water. All of us on that hill side are going to have to deal with.

MC: would the changed building codes changed Stendahl Ridge? What about affordable housing?

DR: the changes that we made is the PRD ordinance....it is very different.

BE: PRD development drastically changed what would be Stendahl Ridge.

MC: the impact on cost and affordable is what I am questioning.

DR: the PRD will be what is used in the future. This will be used with critical areas. What we required a minimum lots size, a variety of lot sizes and lot coverage. Even on a small lot, you will have only so much of lot that you can cover.

JT: Sommerset is the last PUD. Sommerset was the last PUD approved under the old code.

MM: Stendahl is what scared me into joining this group. I have a problem with clear cutting. And nothing was done on Viking when it was built. Traffic doesn't go into any of the other developments. But it goes into Viking.

DR: concurrency requires it to be done within 6 years. And we will be collecting those fees to improve Viking. But it will take more than just one project to widen Viking. The TIP calls for a continuous left turn lane.

DR: 6 years from impacts is what drives road improvement. The fees are paid on the building permit.

MM: when does this start? I understand that it needs to be paid for, but I am trying to find out when the 6 year clock starts?

DR: we will find out when the clock starts ticking.

SS: I have seen the pre app for Tibbets. There is 180 house for Tibbets.

MM: where are we going to put the cars on Finn Hill.

KN: but don't worry, in 6 years we will get the road fixed.

DR: traffic will go through the connecting streets. There will be connections on Finn Hill just like Lincoln.

MM: But Lincoln does not have a freeway access and therefore is not the same.

DR: we need a separate conversation on development.

KN: the conversation needs to be about connectivity. The Finn Hill plans will not work.

DR: we are required by law to set a level of service in 6 years and it is not negotiable.

JT: if we annex, development is primed and ready go, I got the impression the development was pre-planned. There is not realistic chance to address the development.

DR: a pre-application conference is a meeting not an application, they don't bring in plans or engineering studies. I am surprised that this happens before annexation. A letter is generated as to what the requirements are and a neighborhood meeting occurs. Is that sufficient? Remember, it is just a consultation and does not mean that it is going to happen.

JT: do I want to allow this annexation to occur, if it is going to be six years for improvements to occur?

DR: I can't contradict state law. Concurrency says 6 years and we can't violate state years.

JT: I think we need to have a conversation about annexation and concurrency.

DR: I am bound by state law to enforce 6 years concurrency law.

MM: is it the city's policy that citizens that can or cannot sit in on pre-application conferences. Is it an open meeting?

BE: I attended a pre-application conference.

MM: I was told by staff that I was not welcome. What is the policy? It was with a great deal reluctance that we were there. The sooner we know about this the more we can comment.

BE: we will clarify the policy.

DR: we will find out about the policy. As a neighbor it is a tricky thing to work with developers. We created the neighborhood meeting to inform the neighborhood.

DB: is annexation always tied to development?

DR: no, annexation is jurisdictional. We need to have another group that talks about development. It is such an important topic.

JT: In the annexation conversation you will have to address the development processes.

DR: we are going to talk about development later on in the meetings.

DR: next week we are going to talk about orderly development.

BE: two policy questions: what are the rules of pre-apps and when does concurrency start?

DR: I want to get to bottom of this pre-app question tomorrow. We are going to run into this question of development verses development over and over again.

DR: also we will be talking about the CAO next week. How does it affect annexation? So next week is environmental protection and connectivity.

Meeting #2

Annexation task force meeting April 28, 2008

Attendance:

*Bob Bergum (BB)
Bob Hawkinson (BH)
Marilynn Miller (MM)
Becky Erickson (BE)
Bruce Riggins (BR)
Dennis Brown (DB)
Jim Thayer (JT)
Dale Rudolph (DR)
Lynn Hopkins (LH)
Michael Chamberlin (MC)
Shannon Stepan (SS)
Kurt Nordberg (KN)*

DR: Orderly annexation and environmental protection online research really didn't provide any new information regarding this subject. Orderly annexation is defined as the GMA concept of how land is brought into the city.

MM: should we cover old business from the previous week?

DR: yes...we will answer the questions and we will start this next week.

KR: are we being too aggressive on our schedule?

DR: we committed to the city council that we would be on aggressive schedule.

BH: what is the difference between orderly annexation and orderly development? What are we really talking about?

DR: orderly annexation is what we are talking about.

BR: is this more about the overall aspect of annexation? Or is this about specific applications?

DR: this is not about specific applications and will apply to the entire UGA. The south end of Noll road is an example of not orderly annexation.

JT: if the policy and procedures are good we should be able to use them 20-30 years from now.

DR: the county went through a process where the county said that Poulsbo should add more UGA but it violated the county process. Now it is pushed off to 2009.

DR: orderly annexation is about timing. It is driven by the city's ability to provide services. The small square on north Noll road is a barrier to provide services because we would use gravity. Now the developments north of the square, the developments pump sewer over the hill. That is one of our major concerns; if we don't allow a way for the infrastructure to work...we fooled our self into believing that we are really making progress.

MM: questions on the annexation process. The only one that is taken into depth is the 60% petition method. Why isn't the city council using the election method?

DR: the election method doesn't allow the property owners to vote. It is fair game to talk about all the elections methods.

BH: the election method has fallen into a route of not to go to. The election method tends to be very litigious. It turns into a campaign of misinformation.

DR: it excludes and disenfranchises property owners.

MM: there should be some information provided for the 10% election method.

BH: I will send links for more information.

DR: we need to respond back to her questions about why the election method is not used. In the election method you have to be living there to vote. And it generally defeats elections.

DR: there was no talk or notice to public during the 10% petition method. The normal notification process is after the 10% petition; in fact it isn't until the petitioner is actually ready to approach the council with 60% completion of the petition. Is this what we want?

SS: my concern with this is if the annexation is going to affect a road that is going through peoples neighborhoods, they need to be notified earlier in the process.

JT: we need to have neighborhood meeting somewhere in the process. There should have been letters going out to the owners. We should have more notification than is required by statute.

BH: the notification should be more and earlier.

BE: what does that notification look like? How will this happen?

SS: we are very affected by the annexation even though we are further away than 300ft.

DB: 300 ft doesn't even cover a 5 acre parcel. My neighborhood was not notified. Notification now is not an appropriate process.

BE: who does the notification? Who is responsible for notification?

JT: But if the city or county doesn't do it there is no control over the process. There should be more than one notice going out to also tell the status of the process.

BE: it should be the city or county that notifies?

JT: who has the best access to the list of owners?

DB: I don't know remember who sent the letter that notified me.

BH: the first notice is from the city for the public hearing.

DR: is this early enough? Shouldn't the notification be at the 10% application to circulate the petition? It could be notice to people and the start the community meeting.

BE: it should be at the council when the 10% has been achieved. It might be best to have the community meeting because they could meet their neighbors and ask them to sign the petition.

DR: in theory, but that has not happened in the past.

BH: \$50 fee for the petition.

BB: when does this start.....when does the notification start

DR: the 10% and if the council says they are interested in go forward, then this is point of notification. You need to notify your neighbors that you are proceeding, arrange for a neighborhood meeting.

BB: you would want to do this right away to keep down the miss-information. ? What if you have multiple developers?

DR: it will be the initiator of the petition. Whoever pays the fee will be responsible. What will be the timing of the notification?

SS: how do you make sure that all of the property owners are notified?

DR: we can say that this is what the petitioner has to do.

BH: it has to be soon after the petition.

BE: we as a council could say "you have achieved your 10%" now you have to have a community meeting within 60 days.

DR: and you must notify your neighbors within 30 days.

JT: what we are addressing is what the process should be

DR: when we establish the boundary we could also establish the boundary for notifications.

BE: when the petitioner comes to the council, the council says as a condition of the 10% the petitioner he must notify everyone within the boundary area within 30 days and they must have a community meeting within 60 days.

SS: how do we establish the boundary?

MM: my suggestion would be it should be the contiguous area. It should be notification to everyone in the contiguous group. Anything that happens to that whole piece affects everyone.

JT: do you think that this will work in the future.

DR: I think that we will do the process differently in the future. In theory Lemolo could be included but is unlikely.

BE: this notification process will be the policy step that I will write up in the document.

BE: staff goes to development meetings.

DR: staff should go to the annexation meeting.

KN: what about annexation out?

DR: if you want to remove from the UGA this is totally different.

KN: we are in limbo when we are in the UGA.

DR: you have to come to city to join. We don't control the UGA. The county controls the UGA using city development standards. City has no direct role in the UGA.

BH: but the City is setting the rules.

JT: if you want to get out of the UGA then you would have to go the county.

DR: yes, but you would have to completely reverse the complex process and prove that there would be better areas the city could use for annexation.

BR: are all the cost born by the residents of that area?

DR: annexation is jurisdictional. There is no cost to you because you are annexed. Development could cause you to pay some costs. But this is not annexation.

DR: you get charged for sewer a monthly fee. This is a stand by fee. If you are within 200 feet you must hook up but it is not enforced.

MC: how is the 200 ft determined?

DR: we will ask staff.

MM: does the city have access to the information for 60% numbers? How does the city determine this?

BE: it is checked by county tax records.

DR: it goes to the county auditor for certification.

DR: there are people that are saying that if we aren't accommodating the population that is required. This might increase density in town. We had a workshop on zoning and those issues that we could squeeze in more people. Adding density to pre-existing infrastructure is really expensive because you might have to replace the entire infrastructure. It is a very hard sell to increase density in the neighborhoods. We are pressing the envelope in the changes in our code like the PRD. There is a point where the push back starts.

DR: let's move on to environmental protection and the CAO. We need to see the difference between protection standards between the county and the city. The city provided more protection than the county.

KN: but you would have more density.

DR: if utilities were extended into the UGA, it would be developed in the same way. The county zoning is the same. Silverdale is not a city and yet it is within the UGA. So expansion is allowed.

SS: I want to find out what protection means for the creek.

BE: the NPDES comes into play to protect the stream.

JT: is there monitoring of the stream outfalls?

DR: if there is a problem we will take corrective action. Johnson Creek is going to be an amenity for the City someday. The protection in the city and the county are virtually identical.

MM: when are we going to talk about growth targets?

DR: with exception of our residential developments, we are making our density allocations. We will provide a chart showing the growth patterns.

MM: if the density is not met in the city, will we bear the brunt of the all the growth that has not been absorbed?

BH: that is why we all have to be in the city so we can control this.

DR: the only way we could do this is by amending our comprehensive plan.

JT: the zoning is already established before annexation.

DR: before we put anything higher than residential low in the UGA we have to go through a very public process.

MM: if you look at Viking way that the high density could be extended up towards highway 3. If you are not meeting your targets, then what do you do?

DR: we would look at where are already putting high densities before we go into the RL.

BH: she has a really good point. We can't vote to stop these decisions because we can't vote.

DR: the city would fight for more land or give back the target growth.

MM: then I want something in the document that says that the city won't purposefully put increased density in those area that remain un-annexed in order to achieve population targets.

DR: I think we could recommend a policy statement that would not target that population specifically to the UGA.

DR: we need to go through a number of steps to start the reasonable measures.

MM: can we discuss an urban reserve policy?

BB: or how the people in the middle won't get the brunt of the problem.

DR: the city council is not going to talk about the urban reserve until 2009.

MM: are we meeting our growth targets? Are we going to discuss this?

SS: there are approximately 1300 buildable lots in the city? Are we on target?

DR: there would appear to be a lot on the books, but they have not asked for building permits.

DR: we looked at lot of different options in our joint council with the planning commission, in order to achieve these zoning densities. Reasonable measures, we can send these out so that you see what the ways that we are suggested to make this work.

BH: if you don't have the right to vote, the political force to resist the putting the density in those areas that can't vote will be tough.

DR: we can write a policy statement that says that we won't target density in the UGA.

JT: the section that Marilyn is worried about is already connected to a high density area.

DR: we can write a policy statement.

??: wouldn't it be more like that the city would re-zone from RM to RH rather than go into the RL?

DR: we would be more likely to stay on major transportation corridors to up zone.

DR: it is time to adjourn, do we want to take some time next week to look at environmental protections. Yes....we will take ½ hour to talk about environmental issues.

Meeting #3

Annexation Task force of May 5th...

Many papers were passed out by audience and task force members.

DR: Reading materials submitted at meeting time will be seen as homework. Please submit all materials in advance if possible.

Municipal research from Marilyn, showing that the 300 ft rule is not standard. And a question regarding the election method was documented. The entire document can be found in the hot links of the Annexation Task Force Report.

Review of the draft document was completed and we answered the questions that we carried forward from prior meetings. The questions were regarding the concurrency and the 6 year window, the nature of pre-application meetings, annexation notifications and community meetings, and up zoning to achieve target growth. Corrections were suggested and the document was changed.

BH: regulation without representation: It still is not fair that upzoning could occur before annexation. Can we find out if we can change the zoning without permission from the county?

SS: can we talk about annexation for watershed purposes instead of others reasons?

DR: if we don't develop the west side, where we will develop. We must concentrate growth in the urban areas. Watershed is not really an annexation issue.

[Then follows a lengthy statement on water runoff and storm water detention.]

DR: Development has to follow strict storm water guidelines. The idea to changing it to RL or getting out of the UGA is not going to happen.

BH: Issues like storm water runoff are issues because you will not be able to convince people that it is ok to go into the city. Dale you are right technically but the people have serious concerns that must be addressed. The people need to see something rather than just a conversation. They need to be told how the storm water will work after annexation.

DR: Ok...[detailed conversation on the storm water].

JT: if in the petitioning processing we could have a community meeting to address these concerns.

BH: arguing for more detail and we now have more detail now.

LH: the driving force behind annexation is development and expansion. The people that have been on the west side for a long time, they don't feel like they are part of the process. It is the development, not the annexation that is at the heart of this problem.

Development conversation:

DR: [recap on connection, development standards, tree standards policy]

DR: when does planning occur? There are many types of planning. Comprehensive plans which are driven by supply, water and sewer availability. Development planning which is when the individual developments are planned. This is where you

can actually see what is going in next door. These are governed by hearing examiner. Master plans are for single owners. We also have transportation corridors. [Detailed conversation regarding development planning on Viking Avenue, Noll Road]. We also might want to look at an intermediate course of planning. But there are considerations for this level of planning. How does the road get put in? The developers put the road in because we (the city) can't afford to pay for it. Transportation grants are used to pay for existing problems. Olhava paid for many other roads around the city, and Poulsbo Place built Iverson. The only way development infrastructure occurs is when developers pay for it.

SS: does the city use eminent domain?

DR: the city does not use eminent domain. But if the developers don't purchase an easement, you are in pretty good shape. The developers must deal with various land owners to achieve their easements.

DR: Regional storm water is even harder.

BE: On Noll Road a group of developers are working together.

DR: If the city condemned a property the city would have to pay for fair market value. It is possible that you could get a better deal from the developers than the city could.

LH: Could a developer get caught in the middle of a development and make a large mistake?

DR: it could happen, theoretically. But they have to bond to various level of completion.

DR: we have looked into finding a way to plan; we have never found other than the use of general funds or a utility fund to pay for the planning.

DR: [detailed conversation regarding local improvement districts and late comers agreements.]

DR: The developer's agreements are involved with phasing a project in College Market Place. [Detailed conversation about all the improvements provided by the developers of College Market Place.]

BH: can you wipe out an easement?

DR: no, not really...

JT: question on the stand by fees, why is there a different language regarding this in different city publications. We need to find out the answer.

DR: we really need to know the answer if the sewer fee is discretionary.

JT: and how the distance is measured...we need to find out.

MM: we need to find out if the connection is feasible.

DR: we need to find out and if it is good policy.

SS: is there a hook up fee?

DR: yes, absolutely...

BH: if your septic system fails then you don't even have a house to sell or it becomes valueless as it is unusable.

End of meeting..With conversation regarding coming May 12th

Meeting #4: Round Table Discussion

05/12/08: Group #1

City of Poulsbo Annexation Task Force Public Meeting

Notes from Kurt Nordberg

Group Members:

Steve Johnson (SJ)

Bob Hawkinson (BH)

Kurt Nordberg (KN)

Jim Groh (JH)

Jim Thayer (JT)

Linda Berry-Maraist (LBM)

Shari Hagey (SH)

Jim Hagey (JH)

Bruce Riggins (BH)

John Lee (JL)

Questions for Annexation Task Force

Everyone seemed to agree that the current process of notification does not work/happen. What can we do about notification of the surrounding area of proposed annexations?

(JG) The current infrastructure is taxed sewer, water, roads, etc. Who will pay for the upgrades to the infrastructure?

(SH) How is information from this annexation going to get to the people?

(JH) Can someone come to the city and get an annexation package? Something that will walk whomever through the process of annexing their land?

(SJ) What if an individual land owner wants to annex into the city? Will small land owners will need to hire a developer or wait for a bigger group to develop? How much will it cost?

(SJ) Does the Tibbets annexation need to reapply for annexation? What are the fees?

(JH) Who will notify people in the surrounding area of the proposed annexation? The 300' notification does not happen.

(SJ) Is there an annexation Guru? Is there a person with the city that knows and understands annexation?

(BH) What if we want better police service? Can we not annex into the city?

(SJ) Can you put a hold on taxes when property is annexed into the city?

(JL) How many animals (pets) can a property owner have?

(JL) How many livestock animals can a property owner have? (Horses, cows, chickens)

(JL)Will County Current Use/Open Space/Timber/Agriculture Tax laws still be in affect when a property is annexed? Can one still use these tax advantages when they are in the City?

(JL)How will my property taxes be affected once my property is annexed into the city?

(JL)Does the city value larger pieces of land with forest, wetlands, streams and animals? What about the natural services these properties provide such as aquifer recharge, storm water management, oxygen, quality of life? What sort of protections will the city afford for those property owners choosing to conserve these resources?

(JL)Storm water

Isn't storm water infrastructure, once developed and installed, become the responsibility and liability of the City? What happens when the "pre-development water flow standard" is violated? Does the city become responsible for the costs to bring such systems into compliance?

Who pays for the damages caused by poorly executed, poorly planned storm water management systems.

(JL)Can a "grandfathered use" property be sold to a new owner and have the "grandfathered use" still exist?

(JL)Will the city ever use the Viewside Water System as part of its water infrastructure?

(JL)Can a property owner, of a larger parcel of land, build one single-family dwelling, as opposed to maximizing dwelling units the property zoning allows? What about out buildings, barns etc?

(JL)Sewer Vs. Septic –

What are the requirements for sewer connections?

Does a property of an existing septic system have to hook up to sewer?

Can a property owner install his own septic system within the city?

What are the costs associated with sewer?

(JL)Municipal Water vs. Wells

If we are in the city can we drill our own well?

Do we have to connect to city water?

(JL)Where does the liability for property/personal damage exist between critical areas/natural resource areas/larger natural undisturbed lands and urban development? (Open space corridors?) (Comp Plan Update Issue)

(JL)Should existing property use take precedence over new property development? (Congruity & Interconnectivity) (Comp Plan Update Issue)

(JL)RCW 36.70A.160 - Identification of open space corridors – purchase authorized Each county and city that is required or chooses to prepare a comprehensive land use plan under [RCW HU36.70A.040UH](#) shall identify open space corridors within and between urban growth areas. They shall include lands useful for recreation, wildlife habitat, trails, and connection of critical areas as defined in [RCW HU36.70A.030UH](#). Identification of a corridor under this section by a county or city shall not restrict the use or management of lands within the corridor for agricultural or forest purposes. Restrictions on the use or management of such lands for agricultural or forest purposes imposed after identification solely to maintain or enhance the value of such lands as a corridor may occur only if the county or city acquires sufficient interest to prevent development of the lands or to control the resource development of the lands. The requirement for acquisition of sufficient interest does not include those corridors regulated by the interstate commerce commission, under provisions of 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1247(d), 16 U.S.C. Sec. 1248, or 43 U.S.C. Sec. 912. Nothing in this section shall be interpreted to alter the authority of the state, or a county or city, to regulate land use activities.

The City has not “identified open space corridors within and between urban growth areas”. Shouldn’t annexation be held off until overall comprehensive planning occurs-planning that is compliant within the GMA?

(JL)RCW 36.70A.070.3e – Mandatory Elements

(3) A capital facilities plan element consisting of: (a) An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the locations and capacities of the capital facilities; (b) a forecast of the future needs for such capital facilities; (c) the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities; (d) at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and (e) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent. Park and recreation facilities shall be included in the capital facilities plan element.

Shouldn’t the city hold off on annexing land if it does not have “probable funding”? Again, the comprehensive plan gives the opportunity to bring all elements of the plan into compliance; including funding.

(JL)RCW 36.70A.110. 3 – Comprehensive Plans – Urban Growth Areas

*(3) Urban growth should be located **first** in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, **second** in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and **third** in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas. Urban growth may also be located in designated new fully contained communities as defined by RCW [HU36.70A.350U](#)*

As I am human, these notes are typed from my hand written notes or inputs sent to me by my request (so I didn’t have to take notes☺). I reserve the right to correct these notes or add additional notes/clarifications.

Group #2....Notes taken by Dale Rudolph

ANNEXATION TASK FORCE
PUBLIC ROUNDTABLE
MAY, 12, 2008

Comments and Questions:

There was considerable comment from a Mrs. Hagwell, who was previously annexed into the City. She apparently signed the annexation petition in 2000, then had criminal incident that has turned her against being part of the annexation any longer. Mrs. Hagwell felt she was misled by a number of parties that led her to originally support annexation. She has issues with road ownership related to Marajeane Lane NW, but apparently this is between Mrs. Hagwell and other private parties. Mrs. Hagwell repeatedly reminded us that Viking Way is the proper name of the road from

the South City Limits, and that Viking Avenue is only along the businesses. She owns 5.2 acres of land and has her own water and septic system, does not want to develop her property or get utility services from the City. There are no questions to be resolved on this comment; however, a lesson could be learned that an improved public information process is needed to minimize confusion for future annexations.

Hawkinson:

Morajeau runs from Liberty Road south across the west sides of the Gaines and Hensley properties, ending at Johanna Vei. This is nowhere near Mrs. Hagwell's property. I think she was talking about the road which runs west from Viking Avenue (it's still avenue at this point) along the Rabb, Hagwell and Watts properties to the Nathan Glen 40-acre parcel. Real estate records show this road is owned in fee simple by Nathan's Glen. Mrs. Hagwell does not own any portion of this so far as I can tell.

Historical comment -- several of these hiatuses are located around Liberty Bay. You might recall the current Fire Station property had one of these on it and we had to do a quiet title action as no one could figure out who owned this strip. 16.5 feet equals one rod, an archaic term for legally describing real estate.

*Molly Lee commented on the lack of diversity planned by the City. She believes that GMA intends for cities to plan to include diversity, including agriculture, livestock and timber. Councilman Rudolph explained that the City is required to plan for urban density, but the City Code allows for continuation of current uses, but not expansion. Molly asked *if this right continued with the land (i.e. passed on to future land purchasers)*. Although Councilman Rudolph didn't think so, this will be confirmed with staff. Molly later asked a policy question – *why annex more property before infilling the existing City Limits?* Councilman Rudolph responded that annexation is change in jurisdiction, not development, however, conceded that this is a policy question that the City Council should address (*should annexation be used to control/limit development?*) *Should there be a development related process to control the rate of development?*) Molly also asked *whether the City would allow conservation easements like Kitsap County – such easements would be initiated by a private party, but would remove potentially developable property.**

The question was raised – can you build a new house on a large lot in the UGA? Kitsap County allows for a "shadow plan" for how future houses could be developed to achieve the zoning density, the single house could be permitted. Councilman Rudolph indicated he believed that the City would require a short plat to sever the property such that construction would not preclude achieving future density. The question is - would the UGA follow the County or City procedures? Also, the requirement to short plat needs to be verified.

Rudolph:

[HUPoulsbo Municipal Code](#)UH

[HUTitle 18 ZONING](#)UH

[HUChapter 18.16 LOW DENSITY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT \(RL DISTRICT\)](#)UH

[HU18.16.040 Lot requirements.](#)UH

The following minimum lot requirements shall be met:

A. Lot area: seven thousand five hundred square feet. There shall be a maximum density of five dwelling units per gross acre. There shall be a minimum density of four dwelling units per net acre. The maximum lot size shall be ten thousand eight hundred ninety square feet. A parent lot may remain larger than ten thousand eight hundred ninety square feet; however, it must be able to be further subdivided in seven thousand five hundred square foot increments.

Another question was raised – can a septic system be built within the UGA (or an annexed area)? Councilman Rudolph indicated he believed the City could allow a septic system if no sewer were available, but that the City would require a “dry sewer” be installed to the property line for future connection - this needs to be confirmed.

Lynn Hopkins started a general discussion of GMA growth requirements, which turned into a question of whether and how target population could be reduced for the City of Poulsbo. Councilman Rudolph indicated that target populations came from a process that involved the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council and a joint planning process with Kitsap County (revising the Poulsbo Subarea Plan), so reducing the target population would require the same process. Councilman Rudolph also explained that any reduced target population would have to be redistributed within the County, an might require forcing that target population on some other area, whereas, Kitsap County has already done the public process to establish the Poulsbo UGA and it would seem unlikely that they would want to go back through such a public process to move part of Poulsbo’s target population. Also, Mr. Rudolph indicated that the targeted growth for the Kitsap cities is clearly intended to keep the target growth in and around existing urban areas to minimize sprawl throughout Kitsap County.

As a result of discussion of the proposed policy for requiring large, contiguous UGA parcel annexations, there was a question raised after this Roundtable Group broke up – how would this policy affect the properties encompassing the Viewside Watershed and the Viewside neighborhood, as well as, the small number of lots in between them? These properties are not technically contiguous to the rest of the west side UGA south of Finn Hill Road. Councilman Rudolph indicated that the Task Force has not actually discussed these properties, and that the merit a specific review and discussion, as the intent is to preserve the watershed and there seems to be no current obvious advantage in annexing the Viewside neighborhood, which is already developed and is not a barrier to any future development areas.

Hawkinson:

The dictionary defines “contiguous” as sharing a common boundary or touching. Washington annexation cases use the same definition – properties have to touch. I don’t see this word as meaning all properties which touch within a certain UGA area must be annexed all or nothing. At least some of us on the Task Force don’t share the position that annexations must be all or nothing. Perhaps we should revisit this subject.

-----Group #3 Notes taken by Kae Raleigh and transcribed by Becky Erickson

Members:
Becky Erickson
Bob Bergum
Shannon Stepan
Kae Raleigh
James Gaines
Richard Gaines
BF Jennings
John Johnson
Don Sarles
Don Danielson

Protection and involvement by city government is important.

Developer is part of the community, working to assure the neighborhood feelings and protections of the creek.

Required disclosures are very important to the residents. The people that are buying in the UGA need to know that they are in the UGA and what that means.

The use of utility agreement were/are a surprise to many of the residents during annexation.

Richard Gaines: the utility agreement needs to be looked at very closely. Do we really need to do such large areas when just a few need utilities? The policy with regards to utilities needs to be looked at. How can the city grant utility agreements to just a few?

Salmon are now up to the culvert under Cedar Lane. There is a concern that massive development will affect the salmon.

4 houses per acre is defined as low density. How come people can build and ruin your view and yet you still have to pay the same amount of taxes even after you have lost your view?

There needs to be better education of people. There are so many rumors that fly around and distort the process. Annexations are not a question of "if" but "when". It is really about who is going to do the annexations, not if it is going to happen.

Growth will pay for growth. If development occurs, the developer will pay for the infrastructure costs.

Growth has ruined Poulsbo. There does not appear to be any gains except layers of government and higher taxes. The private water system has been there since the '60's. They will not sell the water system to the city and will retain their own septic systems.

There has been damage at the top of the creek. The creek is a valuable resource for the city and must be protected. The new storm water manual should help with that protection. The federal government requires the NPDES for class III cities and forces them to adopt higher standards.

Who pays for water, sewers and roads? Developers pay for the infrastructure. You are not required to hook up to water or sewer if you have functioning systems.

New development means increased property value and increased taxes.

In the future, if the septic fails along the water front, this is not ok and might force annexation.

There is negotiation for paving of private roads with the developers. The developers want to work with the property owners. They want to do it right. (John Johnson). In the pre-application process, they need to meet with property owners to make sure what they are doing is the right thing.

Transportation plan shows proposed roads, but they are not final. The plan is only a rough idea about where the road will go and will be determined during the construction phase.

There needs to be a change in policy. Right now 60% can approve an annexation without notifying the rest of the neighborhood. Everyone should be notified.

Are land uses grandfathered? Such as farms?

Standby fees: all fee structures needed to be checked and explained.

*Meeting #5
May 19, 2008*

*Dale Rudolph (DR)
Kurt Nordberg (KN)
Marilyn Miller (MM)
Dennis Brown (DB)
Bob Hawkinson (BH)
Bob Bergum (BB)
Jim Thayer (JT)
Shannon Stepan (SS)
Becky Erickson (BE)*

Scheduling conversation: we will be presenting to the City Council on Wednesday June 4, and then will incorporate the council input into the document. The task force document will be edited the document by email.

*Council Work shop will be June 4
Next meeting will be June will be June 9 and then again on the 16th where we will be done.
Next Council Meeting will be July 2, and then we will act on the final document.*

*(KN) coming to consensus on the document...have we come to consensus on any policy? We did not come consensus on annexing the whole UGA.
(DR) When we do it in the document form, we will be producing a minority/majority portion within the document.
(DR) we did come to consensus about the timing about notifications.
(BE) we have come to consensus on several issues
(KN) we need to define what consensus is.*

(DR) let's talk about last week: have you had a chance to read the chart of questions? The chart is broken into several different categories...including infrastructure, policy, land use, etc. If we group things in categories it is easier to see what the questions are and if there are duplications.

*(DR) How did things go last week?
(KN) People felt like they were heard.
(BE) how do we get the word out to people about the workshop?
(SS) people hear that word annexation, but they really don't know that they are in the UGA
(DR) what about all the people came to public hearings? Do you think the round table helped them to be heard?
(BH) once people get shut down; they don't really want to participate anymore*

*(BB) people don't take things seriously until they see that it is really affecting
(DR) we have to keep trying to reach out to people...you can't quit just because
people don't respond...that is how your get bad government*

(DR) went through the questions...

*(DR) John Lee asked questions about liabilities, and natural resource lands? I don't
understand the comment or question.*

*(John Lee) if trees are undermined by development, who is liable for the trees that
come down.*

(DR) windfall is a big problem...two good questions.

*(KN) if developers go bankrupt who is going to pick up the pieces. If you go to the
meetings with developers, make them put it in writing.*

*(DR) a development proposal can be vested, but a developer can change the
development. A plat has pages of conditions of approval and is tied to the property.
Until the developer has it in the conditions of approval there is no real way to know
what the development will be.*

*(DR) the tree being undermined by development.... that is a private property issue,
not a city issue.*

(BH) you have to stay with the process, you must have constant vigilance.

*(John Lee) we protect what is left, and place humans where they are appropriate,
which takes precedence, humans or the natural environment.*

(JT) Is staff going to give the answers that we need?

(DR) we are going to try very hard to encourage staff to give us the answer.

(DR) who pays for water, sewer and roads...this is the question.

*(DR) we will change the question of failing septic will this force annexation or will
the city grant a utility agreement? This will make it a policy question.*

*(BB) if you are within the city limits and you're septic fails, are you forced on to
sewer?*

(DR) that is a good question, and we need to address it

*(DR) under economic situations, would we force hooking up to sewer. At the PSRC,
this has been a long conversation. Property owner has the right reasonable use of
your property.*

*(DR) under economic hardship issues, we wouldn't force you to hook up sewer but
might require a "dry" hook up but not to extend the line: this falls into a "reasonable
use" of your property*

*(DR) costs associated with sewer...your cost is to extend it to the main...whether or
not there is a main to extend is another consideration: connection fees can be
answered*

*(DR) would the city allow you to build a house on acreage? We need to get answer
to this from staff.*

(DR) what is cost of annexation? How much do you have to pay?

(KN) this is a Steve Johnson question...

(JT) a developer is not necessary for annexation

*(DR) all annexations are not lead by developers, individuals can petition, but now we
would rather have people come together because we would rather do it at one time.*

(KN) how would the cost be distributed?

(DR) as far as I know there is just an annexation fee. .

(BE) reads the fees from Steve Johnson...total is \$1950

(DR) we would only charge these fees once...some might come back from escrow.

(DR) will the Tibbets have to be refilled? We will get an answer.

(DR) questions about things being "grandfathered" use. We will need to find out...

(DR) we will find out whether or not an existing use can be sold

(DR) we will find out about raising livestock (can you raise a pig)....

(BE) concept of an ombudsman...something we can discuss.

(DR) the annexation guru is Barry Berezowsky, and Edie is the planner that handles most annexations.

(DR) some of the items on the question grids are really just comments and are categorized in that way

(BE) are there any other questions that aren't on the list?

(KN) question about the bulk mailing that was sent out; it almost looked like the city did this.

(DR) I met with those people that produced the document....and that it added a confusion factor that we don't need. The intension was good, but it was premature.

(BH) it is very clear that the document did not come from the city,

(SS) it was not clear that it was from a developer

(DR) if you own acreage, your property taxes will go up after annexation.

(MM) you do not have to your property in the city to have your property taxes increase

(DR) if you are a ½ down, there is no re-assessment.

(BE) the land on Noll road was sold at the peak....and caused the huge increases

(DR) the whole tax system is based on speculation of land value and comps

(DR) annexation will cause increase in taxes

(Katherine) other zones can be available in the comp plan which would change the land capacity analysis, and we do want parks and open space. While the comp plan is being amended shouldn't it be on table that we can use other zones? Who is responsible for re-zoning in the UGA?

(DR) there is only residential low zoning in the UGA. This is the comp plan and subarea plan. There is no zoning change under annexation.

(Katherine) who can introduce the idea of new zones?

(DR) there is no movement afoot to change the zoning code

(KN) there is a move to change the zoning

(Katherine) why isn't there a zoning code for agricultural?

(DR) I find it inconceivable that we lower our zoning code.

(KN) why are we not planning for future open space (significant)

(DR) we are planning for parks but not 200 acres

(BE) the county assessor should come back and look and we as a city should ask him to come back and check to make sure the tax appraisal values are done correctly.

(MM) why isn't there a zoning for non-buildable lands. Why wouldn't you do this?

Why should we just tax people because they are there, they just got brought into the city. And these people are not looking to sell their property. I would like to see a zoning so that these people can see some relief. And this causes people to not want to come into the city. They will be less likely to want to come into the city if there is no way to protect them from the increased taxation.

(DR) this is a policy decision. But this would not be legal with regards to GMA.

(BH) leave the zoning alone, but have an overlay. Maybe a temporary zoning that automatically would go away at sale.

(DR) TDR program are to create more rural property

(BH) we are looking for a solution and need to be creative

(MM) you can take the whole area in and not 1 person would do develop and you are still within your target of 2025. You have met your obligation.

(JL) you can down zone and it's been approved by the hearing board.

(DR) once again, I will bring these ideas to the council as a policy discussion.

(DR) what are the things that you want proponents of annexation to bring the community meetings?

(MM) it's pretty basic, how is it going to affect me financially, how am I going get around, how is it going to affect me?

(KN) basically scrub our list and get our top questions.

(DR) you are going to ask the petitioner these questions.

(BH) yes, we will ask the petitioners.

(Molly Lee) maybe what are demands are for the area.

(DR) the petitioner shouldn't be answering the cities' questions.

(KN) at the community meeting was anything documented?

(Katherine) what about neighborhood plan? How do we assure you about our goals that will go with the neighborhood? There is no creditability from the developer. How do we do this?

(DR) we obviously have a dramatic opportunity to improve communication

(DR) almost everything that a developer says is all speculation. There is no obligation other than what is in the code.

Annexation Task Force Work Shop with the City Council of Poulsbo June 4, 2008

Dale Rudolph (DR) Councilmember
Jeff McGinty (JM) Councilmember
Becky Erickson (BE) Councilmember
Kathryn Quade (KQ) Mayor
Linda Berry-Maraist (LM) Councilmember
Connie Lord (CL) Councilmember
Ed Stern (ES) Councilmember
Barry Berezowsky (BB) Planning Director

Discussion of the Power Point presentation. (Please see enclosed Power Point presentation).

(DR) There is a handful of specific recommendations that we do have consensus on: staff is working on a annexation document that explains the process. We believe that the answering to these questions will be useful in the future. Additionally, we are recommending a new notification process which includes specific timing of 30 days to notify everyone in the area at the 10% point and 60 days to provide a community meeting. This will provide a significant improvement to the annexation process.

(JM) how will people be notified?

(DR) tax assessor's roles.

(BE) this will provide a real transparent notification process which we do not have now.

(DR) the people are concerned that we could change the zoning out in the UGA because the people in the UGA have no political power, and could shift density to the UGA. What we are recommending that we treat everyone the same in the city. It would be the same process throughout the City.

(BB) Any change in zoning would be initiated by the County, not by the City, but would be through extensive legal notice.

(DR) during the subarea plan process the county wanted more density in the UGA, and the city said that we would not go in that direction.

(DR) We don't want to do anymore incremental annexations. We have approximately 10 areas left which we would want to annex without splitting. Maybe they could come in together. On the west side, it could be one big annexation. It was our intent to get much large annexations in the west side. The rationale behind this is the infrastructure planning. We need more roads on the west side, like a neighborhood collector. The same thing is occurring on the east side.

(ES) It is clear that the Noll Road and Vinland will get the lion share of the school dollars and location in the future.

(DR) we identified 10 areas that are distinct for annexation

(DR) next policy decision is whether to encourage or discourage or disallow policy decisions for certain non-urban usage and taxes that are impacted. The tax assessor raises taxes upon annexation and that doesn't seem fair to many people. .

(ES) this is the crux of issue of the people coming into the city. The larger lots are hit hard and burdened. We need to protect our people.

(DR) the concept of a downzone, overlay or some other way to address the fact the taxes will go up. We might have a mechanism to prevent this. What it suggests is to use our land use code to fix a tax problem. The concept of using land use to undermine our own comp plan is probably not a good idea. We develop our comp plan and now we don't want to implement it because some people got their taxes increased.

(CL) We need copies of the slides.

(JM) this is what I have heard from a lot of people...and they might be forced to sell out.

(DR) this is a big policy issue to subsidize sub-urban land use

(JM) One minute people are one side of the line then the line changes, it doesn't seem fair.

(DR) I question whether or not we can fix this with land use policy.

(ES) but we practice nexus with land use and taxation. So we should use land use to repair the tax policy.

(BB) there are many people that believe that should not realize that gain until the land is sold. This change in policy would be adverse to GMA and comp plan.

(LM) one of the concerns is the property taxes. We might be able to do change policy by recognizing the proximity to utilities.

(BB) the price of an acre of land in Poulsbo has increased more than others areas in the county. Bubble has burst but the last comp is still the inflated price.

(DR) the city could take a leadership role to bring these problems forward to the county.

(DR) can a person build a new house on a large lot? We do not have the legal authority to enforce a subdivision on a large lot, or shadow plat is no longer has legal authority.

(BB) if someone owns an acre in the city of Poulsbo, you can carve off a large lot.

(DR) we can disallow the short plat of large lots

Introduction of Kurt Nordberg (KN), Marilyn Miller (MM), Bob Hawkinson (BH), June Henson (JH), Jim Thayer (JT) (Task Force).

(MM) I think it is unfair to force the citizens to have to put themselves in some conservation area in order to avoid the increase in taxes that comes from annexation. To put the additional burden on the citizens is unreasonable and we will continue to piece meal annexation. If the city annexed the entire area we will still have met our obligation to meeting the population allocation.

(BB) yes, we could annex the whole area but I am not sure why would this happen.

(KQ) can the City go to bat for those people that get taken into annexation against their will.

(CL) we need to figure out a way to make this happen.

(BH) if you don't do something to help with the big tax hits, you are going to have piece meal annexation. It is not going to get built out until 2025 yet they are getting taxed like it will built out tomorrow. There has got to be a way to do this. To say that zoning does not impact taxes is not correct.

(DR) zoning will impact taxes.

(BH) up-zoning: if you set a policy that you don't approve a policy of up-zoning is not good enough. This doesn't sound good enough. I have two problems: up-zoning and the taxes.

(KN) it is ½ acre where the taxes hit. And this is about the people.

(BE) thanks to the task force.

(DR) we have 2 more nights of the task force. We would like this to come forward to council on one of the first two meetings in July with our policy recommendations.

(ES) As I was reading the policy question regarding pre-application meetings before annexation it brought up the idea that we are finally going to have to discuss the idea of jurisdiction verses development.

(LM) are we sure that the contiguous annexation is going to work? What about the idea of having a pause before development occurs but after annexation in order to allow for planning?

(DR) the issue of contiguous, we will need to talk about this some more. Incremental annexation is the problem and was our charter as a task force.

(BE) we have to weigh the concerns of the citizens verses the long run costs of infrastructure done badly which is the result of incremental annexation.

Annexation Task Force June 9, 2008

Dale Rudolph (DR)
Becky Erickson (BE)
Bob Hawkinson (BH)
Kurt Nordberg (KN)
Shannon Stepan (SS)
Jim Thayer (JT)
June Hensley (JH)
Lynn Hopkins (LH)
Marilyn Miller (MM)

(DR) is there any feedback from the presentation from the council work shop?
(DR) I presented what I felt things that we had a consensus about, notification concept, density that should be in the newly annexed or the UGA's, the concept of contiguous area, interest from the council on the concept of annexation.
(DR) the taxation issue is broken into two issues: the idea of the existing exemptions being continued or the concept of down zoning to reduce the tax.
(DR) you can put a house on a large lot without having to subdivide.
(DR) discussion of the pre-application conference, there is a clear policy coming from staff about this...and we can talk about it
(DR) Questions or comments about the presentation to council?
(KN) what is the definition of consensus? How can we come to a consensus when we don't what it is?
(BE) are we in consensus on the 30, 60 notification rule?
(KN) what is notification?
(BE) the assessor's roles and by mail from the city
(SS) basically in agreement with that, as long as we define the application area
(DR) if you are annexing in an area, you would need to notify everyone in the UGA.
(JT) it has to be spelled out that it is not just in the annexation boundary but everyone in the UGA
(KN) I am not sure what is going to happen
(BE) this is what I am going to write, back with the 10 percent. At that time we have the petitioner provide a list from the assessor roles of all of the people in the contiguous area of the UGA are notified by mail with 30 days. Those same people will be invited to a community meeting within 60 days of the petitioner gaining the 10%.
(KN) how can we check that everyone has been notified?
(BE) we must have some level of faith that people are not going to operate in a willfully fraudulent way
(DR) how else can we do this? We can only try the best we can...and it will not be perfect
(DR) we can make a map for a notification area
(MM) is it possible to request annexation if you are outside the UGA
(DR) No...not possible
(MM) how about the "respective" UGA will be notified
(BH) that will be too vague
(BH) rather have a map
(BE) ok, we will have a map
(LN) will we have the notification in the paper
(DR) yes
(DR) can the other UGA areas be taken all or nothing? Everything but the west side should be done at one time. We don't want to say all or nothing...what should we say?

(DR) the goal of annexation is orderly development...so piece meal annexation does not promote this goal.

(JT) so the task force was created to promote annexation that would create orderly development?

(BE) it was created for this reason and also to relieve some the fears of the citizens.

(JH) where would the community meetings be?

(BE) fire station or the Vinland Elementary

(DR) this notification process is modeled after the development meetings process

(DR) and someone from the city will be at the meeting...could be planning or public works

(BH) trying to bring in the whole UGA will not solve the problem...you can end up with a checker board affect through piecemeal development.

(DR) piecemeal development occurs; it is not something else you can control.

Piecemeal annexation is a road block but will not prevent piecemeal development.

(BE) do we have consensus on the notification policy?

(DR) yes and we also have an agreement that we don't have a one size fits all policy that draws the boundary as to what area will be annexed. This will be a judgment call as to how much we take in at one time.

(KN) so what is the plan?

(DR) it is to populate this area by 2025. Sewer is an example....the investment had to be made for growth, and after that commitment was made, you must grow.

(BE) are we going to keep things in one piece? Or are we going to split them up to multiple pieces?

(SS) if it is annexed in, is there still a notification for development

(BE) there will be notification for development but only for 300 feet

(DR) if there something that causes and are to be affected, including off site mitigation, there should be more notification.

(DR) we need to add to the law if there is affect beyond the 300 feet limitation

(DR) we can be more onerous than the state law if we need to increase notification

(BH) the development community will fight increased notification rules

(BH) can we put this notifications on the website?

(BE) the county puts notification on the website

(KN) could put color coding of on a map

(DR) that is a great idea....

(DR) we have a good idea about orderly annexation that has been provided by staff...our weak link as a council is usually not as well informed and need to influence earlier on

(DR) where will the road be...in order to do this, everything needs to be east of this...

(BH) look out where the creek will be....once you take in consideration the setbacks, you will be in people's houses...

(SS) there is a light at Edvard...can that be used?

(BE) this is exactly why you need neighborhood planning...

(KN) a new off ramp from highway 3?

(DR) this really is a great exercise that shows the real world and how difficult it is to put in the infrastructure and plan

(MC) what are the rules about putting the road on the border...how would that work?

(DR) the point is that road has to be down to Viking and therefore if you leave the center out, it completely ties your hands.

(JH) the primary concern is the development, we are just spinning our wheels...I coming on board so that we can plan in some way.

(JT) if the annexation does not permit orderly infrastructure then it can't come in

(DR) Noll road, we allowed non-orderly development, but with the understanding that the individual development will be expensive.

- (BE) there are good and bad developers, and the information about what the development means should be explained at the neighborhood meeting.
- (BH) we need to develop a neighborhood plan
- (DR) this is something that Becky and I have wrestled with for long time
- (BH) if the developer wants to develop then they have to pay for the plan, or wait until someone else pays for it or the city pays for it
- (DR) what if you want to just subdivide for your kids?
- (BH) you can build in exceptions to the plan
- (BE) we have done neighborhood plans with the Old Town and Noll Road Corridor
- (DR) the Old Town has not worked and we don't know if the Noll Road will work
- (MM) how is the city going to approve any annexation without a neighborhood plan? How will the city know where the water, sewer and roads will go?
- (DR) the reason why the Tibbets was turned down was that it left the middle un annexed.
- (MM) then you had no problem with the result of those annexations on Finn Hill traffic
- (KN) the fire department said that Tibbets wouldn't work
- (DR) no, the city had a series of questions only.
- (DR) I think we need to write down something about neighborhood planning.
- (MM) I don't know if we don't have something different written down, we have gone through this whole process without accomplishing anything
- (BE) I would love to write down that we would require a neighborhood plan but I don't think we have the legal traction to pull it off
- (BH) what about saying that you can't build until you have a plan?
- (LH) use the professional developer to develop the plan.
- (BH) the developers are taking options on large plots, therefore the developers might not plan....it must be the peoples plan.
- (DR) who is that person that pays for the plan....if the developers want to do this....go forward.
- (BH) people are not going forward for annexation until they know the plan
- (JH) without a plan there is no benefit to annexation....I want it done right....there has to be some assurance that there will be some planning.
- (DR) let's move on...
- (DR) can a citizen sit in on a pre-app conference...see page 7,,, a pre-app meeting is a consultation paid for by the developer. It is not an open meeting, we can and do let a representative in the meeting but they are expected to behave.
- (JH) so this is a very important meeting because if they do everything that is listed....it is the very beginning and therefore why shouldn't the city want it open and more transparent.
- (MM) what is wrong with 12 people going to a meeting?
- (DR) because it is a private meeting over private property
- (DR) we require developers to do a neighborhood meeting
- (KN) there was nothing about requirements wetlands or salmon habitat in the pre-app meeting for Tibbets
- (DR) there is no legal obligation to allow observers into a pre-application meeting. We are allowing attendance out of staff policy
- (MM) are we going to do anything with the informational brochure?
- (DR) yes, we will send out the informational brochure
- (DR) tax questions....we should have a forum with the tax assessor.
- (MM) I don't think that it's fair that the taxes go up because of change in jurisdiction
- (DR) I am opposed to bastardizing zoning code to fix a tax problem

Annexation Task Force June 16, 2008

Dale Rudolph (DR)
Jim Thayer (JT)
Bob Bergum (BB)
Bob Hawkinson (BH)
Marilyn Miller (MM)
Lyn Hopkins (LH)
Shannon Stepan (SS)
Kurt Nordberg (KN)
Michael Chamberlin (MC)
Becky Erickson (BE)

(BE) I will include comments if I receive them electronically
(DR) let's begin with questions that we did not get to last week
(DR) three types of neighborhood planning: corridor study, expand that to an infrastructure study and then the final type would be a neighborhood plan
(DR) we have done a subarea plan...but it is only conceptual, and does not give much predictability
(DR) legal opinion says that there is no basis to requiring the developer to provide planning, and it should be a city requirement.
(DR) there is a precedent for that in that there is a Noll Road study....the city could choose to fund any one of the three but that has not been decided. If I could guess, the council could promise to do this if it does get annexed. What we don't have is whether it could be a condition of development.
(KN) based on your prediction of council opinion what does that mean to the annexation that is pending.
(DR) they could go ahead based on the idea that there would be planning after annexation paid for by the city funded in 2009.
(BE) we are going to have to do some planning, but it is still very difficult to do
(DR) at least there would be a plan...does have affect because of conditional approvals.
(DR) executive summary...let's begin
(JT) end of paragraph; normally this area will be the entire UGA area which the annexation occurs rather than just a map
(SS) I have similar concerns. My concern is if one end wants in, but is not required to notify.
(DR) we will say this is a boundary of the notification...a map that will be the contiguous area
(MM) question on paragraph three....eliminate "professional and controlled area". And what is an interest group? How do we define?
(DR) for SEPA an interest group...it is a declared fact...
(DR) there is only room for 2 or 3 in the room...
(KN) why is a limited number of observers...where is it written?
(DR) this is city policy now...
(KN) where is the city policy written...
(BE) there is not enough room in the room for all the people...it is kind of office policy.
(KN) can we get a number of total people?
(DR) this is a policy for a private meeting....

- (DR) remember, there is a neighborhood meeting...we are saying what we like
...change from requesting to requiring
- (BE) you can give me a statement and I will include it as a minority opinion.
- (MM) (reads her paragraph)....
- (BE) I will substitute Marilyn first paragraph, and then 2nd paragraph that is there.
Everyone ok? Yes...
- (DR) anyone have a comment on paragraph #4? As a policy statement it looks ok....
- (DR) paragraph #5...add two more paragraphs from Jim comments.
- (DR) are you suggesting when this planning should occur?
- (JT) yes....before annexation
- (DR) the sub-area plan is a conceptual plan of putting utilities into the UGA's
- (JT) what do you mean by showing a road?
- (DR) it is conceptual...
- (JT) there has to an overall concept of what is needed....including environmental
areas and open space requirements. To preserve the feel of Poulsbo we want a little
more..seems like there is no real plan. If I was living in the annexation area it would
scare me to death.
- (KN) did you see the Sun...? the newspaper....
- (DR)....Johnson creek will be amenity to the city.
- (BE) let's put Jim two paragraphs into the document.
- (JT) I think it is the city's responsibility. I think it should be done before a lot of
development is done.
- (DR) it is kind of comprehensive plan....
- (JT) it is kind of a vision plan....
- (MM) it is a subarea...a smaller area....for neighborhood planning. There should be a
west side area plan...how is it going to come out the other end...?
- (BH) planning should be done before or after annexation? Wonder if it takes a long
time? Can a developer do it then?
- (BE) it can be considered a volunteering process if done by a developer
- (KN) planning should be done before annexation....
- (JT) planning should be prior to development....different levels of planning should be
done at different stages.
- (DR) the city does care more than county.
- (SS) there does not seem to need some level of planning before annexation. This
needs to be done before annexation.
- (MM) the ideal would be a neighborhood plan from Finn Hill to Sherman Hill.
- (BE) who is paying for it?
- (MM) but ideally that is what we should do....this is just the ideal. But we come back
from that and say what we really can do...
- (JT) I have a problem with imposing something that is outside the UGA
- (DR) can we get a boundary around what we actually do?
- (DR) are we talking about just the west side?
- (DR) the west side is the large potential....
- (KN) will the Gaines and Tibbets have to do this?
- After editing...the answer is that the motion is denied.
- (BE) should we put the three types of planning into this document?
- (MM) it is really more infrastructure planning....not neighborhood planning
- (JT) is there ever a time where the city is going to decide to keep some trees?
- (DR) Never processed a planned residential development which will include some
open space. The PRD provides for open space
- (JT) does the west side UGA include aquifer recharging area
- (KN) we are really concerned about Johnson creek
- (BE) we are done on paragraph 5 and can move on to 6

- (DR) we are going to the brochure...are there any comments?
- (DR) recommend taking 4th bullet out....
- (JT) will fire insurance going down?

Long conversation about how the brochure would not work...and needs to be re-done, especially after the policy changes are adopted

- (SS) it should say that you will be able to vote.
- (JT) what it should say is what is annexation and then give the process....and then list potential concerns like a FAQ section.
- (SS) it doesn't even mention in the potential concerns...it doesn't really address any of the concerns
- (BE)...I think it is very poor.
- (MM) the definition of annexation is not correct....it could be done a lot better
- (DR) I need comments in order to change this...
- (BE) the whole side with the graphics is history...and needs to be changed
- (MM) tax statement is very poor
- (SS) there should be links to the city website.
- (DR) is there a section in the code entitled annexation?
- (BE) is it codified...?
- (DR) email us with changes to the document
- (DR) what else?
- (KN) we need another round table to show the people the answers that we have developed
- (DR) the council meeting will be on for the 9th
- (DR) it is not in program to do another workshop round table.
- (KN) the functional plans, I have not seen them
- (KN) add the math on page 14...\$357.00
- (JT) can't finalize brochure until after the city council
- (KN) can we get the fees for hooking up to water? (page 15)
- (DR) need to have a way of informing late comers agreement when a home is purchased
- (KN) how will private wells be notified if they are taken over? How about private water systems? How are they notified?
- (KN) can we get a link to the fee of the conditional use permit for domestic animal use
- (KN) comment on including fees will be updated to include new fees for neighborhood meeting
- (MM) questions on Mrs. X and her statement...it will be removed.
- (KN) we need to go through all the questions....
- (BE) do you think that the policy questions are the correct ones?
- (BE)...can you go to your neighbors and ask if there is anything we have missed?
- (DR) do we want to go out to the public again for more questions...but we need to wrap this up.

June 23, 2008 Annexation Task Force

Dale Rudolph (DR)
Becky Erickson (BE)
Jim Thayer (JT)
Marilyn Miller (MM)
Bob Hawkinson (BH)
Shannon Stepan (SS)
Kurt Nordberg (KN)
Lynn Hopkins (LH)
Kathryn Quade (KQ)
June Hensley (JH)

Emails to insert from Kurt, Shannon and Bob

(BE) copy paragraph regarding water hookup fee will copy and put in document
(BE) there is no notification for late comers agreements
(DR) according to staff it is not recorded on the property title
(BH) I almost purchased a piece of property that had it listed
(DR) the city has no way to make people record late comer agreement
(DR) if you have questions....I would like to comment here....there is no concept of vesting in annexation
(DR) it depends on whether it is engineering standards can be changed and are not vested. Regulations are vested, not standards.
(DR) Any comments on the executive summary? I have an issue on the pre-app meeting.
(BE) Do you want to put back in the statement to request representative groups.
(DR) but I am not going to spend a lot of time on this..
(DR) annexation pamphlet....the initiation of 10% is not in the pamphletour main message is that the pamphlet needs to be re-written. It needs a complete re-write.
(BE) when they do re-write they should make a frequently asked question along with the pretty pamphlet
(KN) what happened to the Tibbets and Gaines part in the minutes..
(BE) the Tibbets and Gaines annexation was denied.
(DR) on page 6,7,8,9
(KN) more information on Mrs. XXXX on page 19....there are parts that are missing from the notes
(DR) but that wasn't in the note to begin with
(KN) but it should be in the notes..
(BE) could you send it to me in writing....if you send it to me in writing, I will put it in the note
(JT) it says that her property went up in taxes...
(KN) 1600 to 6000 in 2 years was the increase in taxes
(SS) the average person doesn't know if they are in the UGA
(MM) the real estate agent should tell the person buying the house..
(DR) how can we do this....how can we inform people that they are in the UGA?
(BE) we could make the county put it on the county web site.
(DR) they have a subset of the data base and they should be able to do this easily:
let's ask them to do this.

- (KN) on page 7
- (BH) the question on utilities is a troubling...with regards to taxation
- (DR) we need to take some leadership on this question....the assessor is not responsive.
- (DR) we are going to talk to the assessor
- (BE) this is a real big problem and we are going to take a strong position
- (DR) they are not looking at larger picture....the assessor should not think about one citizen at a time
- (DR) the assessor needs to look at a group of citizens called the Poulsbo UGA
- (BH) Edmonds taxes seemed really low...in comparison. Is the taxing policy dictated at a state wide level?
- (KQ) welcome to all....but we need to complete this effort and bring it to an end.
- (DR) we are on page 19, page 20
- (KN) same comment 3....once again the same question about taxation
- (SS) it conveys the idea that you are safe from increased taxes if you don't have utilities available.
- (DR) no view ordinance in the county
- (KN) could be CCR's
- (KN)....changes....page 21 and 23 repeated
- (DR) duplicates...page24....p
- (KN) can we be assured that the salmon can be protected (page 22)
- (DR) the answer is inadequate.
- (BE) more protection will be afforded by the engineering standards
- (MM) change the wording around SEPA....spell out the words.
- (BE) I will change it
- (KN) there is a question in how to develop in Johnson creek with using the 2005 manual.
- (DR)...development will be required to follow the codes in place
- (DR) in the buildable land analysis it is assumed that not all the land will be built to 100%...and there is no city policy on tax reduction programs. The city does honor tax exemptions....
- (KN) why can't we argue to reduce our UGA...
- (DR) I don't think we will want to undo all the UGA....I don't know why Poulsbo took such a large growth target....it proceeded me. If UGA were to be reduced it would be a large process including KRCC
- (DR)....ok then...what is left to be done....please forward your comments to Becky....to include into the documents.
- (DR) I don't think we need to go for another meeting....
- (BE) I will update and get the document out again on Sunday.
- (MM) I gave the document from Bellingham because it was a good document....there is some differences...but it is good.
- (JH) can we put another part in the executive summary..include a number seven?
We want a Q&A or a FAQ document along with a brochure in the executive summary.