

**City of Poulsbo  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Tuesday, March 3, 2009**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jim Coleman  
Gordon Hanson  
Bob Nordnes  
Ray Stevens  
James Thayer

**STAFF**

Andre Kasiniak  
Barry Loveless  
Lynda Loveday  
Karla Boughton, Consultant

**GUESTS**

Dan Baskins  
Stephanie Wells  
Molly Lee  
Becky Erickson  
Jan Wold  
Jim Hagey  
Shary Hagey

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Two vacancies

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

**2. FLAG SALUTE**

**3. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA - none**

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF 2-3-2009**

**MOTION: HANSEN/NORDNES. Move to approve the minutes of 3-3-2009 as presented. 5 for. 2 vacant.**

**5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS**

There were no comments.

**6. 2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT REVIEW**

There was discussion regarding: (1) rescheduling the 2-17-09 meeting that was cancelled due to the consultant being ill; (2) when new population numbers will be received from OFM; (3) when minutes of the joint meeting with the Council will be available; (4) an explanation of the exhibit process for incoming comments from citizens.

Ms. Boughton then started the discussion on the Capital Facilities chapter of the draft comp plan. Items discussed included: (1) funding sources and strategies; (2) funding everything that is on the CIP; (3) what developers are responsible for

building as part of their project; (4) page 193, table CFP-3 identifies capital improvement projects that will be necessary to support the City's projected 2025 population of 14,808; (5) the 6-year CIP is updated on a yearly basis; (6) making sure that policies mesh with each other; (7) updating of functional plans' timing is six years, which works in tandem with the 6-year CIP; (8) page 162 shows who is responsible for implementing the plans; (9) the CIP is prioritized by year not by month; (10) funding ~~is~~ must be identified for the projects that ~~is~~ are on the 6-year CIP; (11) the CIP is a commitment by the city; (12) sometimes items get delayed but usually only by a few months, but not more than one year; (13) page 105, CF 3.3 needs to be re-worded; (14) timing of the collection and use impact fees; (15) currently impact fees are collected through SEPA and have to be used for the specific improvement development; (16) with an impact fee ordinance the fees could be used anywhere in the city; (17) page 107, CF 5.2 needs to be clarified; (18) impact fees are different from connection fees.

A Commissioner asked when they can expect to see the changes they are recommending to the comp plan.

Karla explained that at the end of their review they will receive a copy with strike out and bold text to indicate the changes that were made.

The discussion continued with: (19) connection fees are generally used for maintenance and are separate from new development fees; (20) most projects have both new construction and maintenance issues; (21) there is a system in place for demonstrating where money came from and what is was spent on; (22) the city's finance department and the state auditors review what and how mitigation funds are spent on projects on a regular basis; (23) page 110, siting of schools is referring to higher education schools not local K-12 or Olympic College; (24) page 187, there should be some discussion regarding cost effectiveness and compliance with laws; (25) the city has to maintain (level of service) LOS standards; (26) page 189, clarification regarding the storm water "update" vs. "plan"; (27) page 189, park plan chapter number is missing; (28) page 191, NPDES definition is needed.

The discussion continued with pages 204 and 205, regarding: (29) water usage; (30) summer use problems; (31) pump run times; (32) storage; (33) fire flow; (34) water rights; (35) quantity; (36) conservation; (37) consumption; (38) pricing; (39) service to the UGA; (40) sharing of resources; (41) growth projections.

The discussion then moved on to the sanitary sewer section of the comp plan regarding: (42) jurisdictional responsibility for maintenance; (43) measurement; (44) down stream constriction; (45) timeframe for repairs; (46) overflow vs. measurement issues; (47) the 6 year CIP doesn't have downstream sewer improvement projects on it at this time; (48) various repair ideas are being looked

at; (49) sewer costs are based on peak flow; (50) there is no sur-charge; (51) installation of a meter on the city side of the bay.

## **7. CONTINUED COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS**

Molly Lee discussed: (1) identifying funding sources; (2) population allocation and (3) impact fees.

Jan Wold discussed: (1) wrong population numbers are used in the plan; (2) the park plan; (3) timing of the collection of impact fees.

Dan Baskins discussed: (1) impact fee timing; (2) a policy is needed regarding limited capacity; (3) “use it or lose it” regarding impact fees.

## **8. COMMISSION COMMENTS**

The subject of what to do with Viking Avenue was discussed at length.

The Commissioners then briefly discussed the cancellation of next week’s meeting because they are ahead of schedule and have finished with the subject matter that was scheduled to be discussed that night.

Their next meeting will be a joint meeting with Council on the 17<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 pm

---

Ray Stevens  
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission