



**CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015
6:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASHINGTON**

CALL TO ORDER - Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
EXECUTIVE SESSION

Potential Litigation (RCW 42.30.110(1)(i))

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 25 and July 9, 2015 Planning Commission Meetings

PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept public comment on off agenda items

PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Comprehensive Plan Amendment Applications

- Submitted by S. Thomas, to change the designation from OSR-2 to NSC for a property located at 4552 Point White Drive, immediately west of the Lynwood Center NSC area
- Submitted by A. Cainion, to change the designation from OSR-0.4 to NSC for a property on Fletcher Bay Road, immediately south of the Island Center NSC area

Glossary: Review and confirm modification of "Shall" and "Should" in *Glossary*

Environmental Element: Review changes to DRAFT *Element*

Economic Element: Review public comment from July 29 Workshop,

PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

ADJOURN

CALL TO ORDER - Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure

Planning Commission Meeting was called to order by Chair J. Mack Pearl at 6:00 PM.

Commissioners William Chester, Jon Quitslund, Michael Lewars and Maradel Gale were in attendance. John Thomas and Julie Kriegh were absent. City Staff present were City Attorney Lisa Marshall, Special Project Planner Jennifer Sutton, Associate Planner Christy Carr and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes. City Consultant Joe Tovar was also present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - Potential Litigation (RCW 42.30.110(1)(i))

The regular Planning Commission meeting was suspended for an executive session. Chair Pearl informed the public: "The Planning Commission will adjourn to an executive session with legal counsel to discuss Potential Litigation pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(i). The executive session will

begin at 6:00 PM, will be 1 hour long and will conclude at 7:00 PM. No action will be taken during executive session.”

Recording of the Planning Commission meeting was paused at 6:00 PM.

At 7:00 PM the Planning Commission re-entered Council Chambers and recording began again. Chair Pearl informed the public: “The Planning Commission has returned from an executive session where we discussed Potential Litigation pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(l)(i). No decisions were made.”

The agenda was reviewed. No conflicts were disclosed.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES - June 25 and July 9, 2015 Planning Commission Meetings

**Motion: I move that we approve as distributed the minutes for June 25, 2015.
Gale/Quitslund – Passed unanimously 5-0**

**Motion: I move that we accept as distributed the minutes for July 9, 2015.
Gale/Chester – Passed unanimously 5-0**

PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept public comment on off agenda items
None.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Ron Peltier, Citizen – Commented on page 11 of the Environmental Element concerning sea level rise. He felt this section should include a mention of how this phenomenon would affect the Island’s aquifers. The salt water/fresh water interface was determined by the opposing pressure of the fresh water aquifer and the salt water. As the salt water rises, that interface could potential come in increasing the potential for salt water intrusion. Under Sea Level Rise in E and 8, he suggested they add something about the aquifers and potential impact from sea level rise. Commissioner Quitslund asked if this was not included with the issues related to sea level rise. Not any of the issues were laid out but this was going to a water management program, so the integrity of aquifers was part of that whole kettle of fish. He felt it was included among the issues to be addressed in accordance with that. He felt that even though they were talking about a single sentence, it was fairly comprehensive in nature. Mr. Peltier also spoke about two sections relating to climate change: sea level rise and greenhouse gases. He suggested they actually acknowledge climate change was happening, would have adverse impacts and was primarily caused by human activity. Commissioner Gale informed Mr. Peltier they had just received a large amount of information about climate change that day and she was recommending the information be forwarded to the Drafting Committee for incorporation into the Environmental Element. He thought that would be great. A passage Mr. Peltier had always liked on page 26 was read: “In pre-application conferences, as part of the review of development applications, (it used to say the City shall, now it’s just) encourage property owners to maximize the preservation of trees and maintain and enhance the quality of tree groves through appropriate site design and construction methods as well as space dedication of areas that contain those resources.” He questioned the removal of “the

City shall.” He knew they had not been doing it, but maybe they should leave it in there and encourage landowners to retain more trees and design with them.

William Palmer, Consultant to Andrew Cainion – Had a couple of points of clarification he wanted the Planning Commission to address. He stated he was there representing Andrew Cainion, whose Comprehensive Plan Amendment application was on the agenda for later that night. One of his questions had to do with the Consultant’s (Joe Tovar’s) text on Neighborhood Service Centers (NSC). He referenced the July 2, 2015 draft of the Land Use Element stating his concern was that the text did not address the site specific application that Mr. Cainion had filed. It recommended the only change to be in a 10 acre site on the NW corner of Miller and Battle Point Roads. Since that was the only recommendation in the Consultant’s package, he wondered how that fit with Mr. Cainion’s ability to proceed with his application or did it foreclose consideration of his application. He pointed out another reference for a special area planning process requirement for Rolling Bay Center (Land Use Policy 4.1) with a multi-year work program which seemed like a recipe for another 10 year delay. He wondered how these two things in the Consultant’s draft proposals affect what the Planning Commission can do at this point in time in light of the site specific application by Mr. Cainion. Chair Pearl stated at this time those were recommendations and the Plan was not in force at this time. He went on to say part of the discussion tonight was whether those processes are what the Commission wants or not.

Loyal Moore, Citizen – Moved to Bainbridge Island 20 years ago and has been a resident of the original Pleasant Beach Village for the last 10 years. When you move to an area, selecting a place to reside is a very significant decision. You look at the accommodation of the facility itself as far as the house and that’s pretty much a fix, so you make up your mind that maybe you will make a few revisions but the property around you may be the most important part of your decision. As far as where you want to reside and the conditions under which you want to reside there. The greatest protection as landowner is zoning and to casually change the complete complexion of an area as has happened in the Lynwood Center area by way of re-zoning takes away the protection they assumed they had with zoning doesn’t seem to exist. He felt the requested zoning change being considered tonight would have a tremendous impact as far as traffic and congestion. He questioned how soon there would need to be a traffic light in Lynwood Center. They were being inundated by a lot of people who just stroll the area, disregard for crosswalks and the more casual they are, the less involved they are in the community, the more likely they are to be indifferent to it. He had concern about the ultimate development of the area of the lumberyard containing the piles. If this was re-zoned, how could they be utilized? Could they be replaced? Would they be grandfathered in? That was something that could have a significant impact on the area and he would like it to be duly considered.

Ken Harrington, Citizen – President of the Pleasant Beach Village Homeowners Association. He stated they had a group of homes on the water immediately adjacent to the Thomas property which was on the agenda that night. He stated he had conversations with most of the homeowners and a lot of them have concerns about this (possible re-zone). The primary concern was that if the Thomas property was re-zoned to NSC, they have no idea what would happen next door to them. The residents would need a whole lot more information about what would happen should the re-zoning occur. He thought he could speak on behalf of virtually all the homeowners saying they would like to see the Special Planning Area Process followed for this even though it was less than an acres and even though the Schell Chelb estuary was immediately adjacent. It may not make commercial sense to add even more commercial to those that are already existing and are still

building in the area. He asked Commissioners to recall that the Planning Commission recommended in 2010 on the other property that these recommendations went through in order to avoid the Special Planning Area Process. Speaking for his association, he hoped they would NOT do that and that they would recommend using a Special Planning Area Process even if it was less than one acre.

Andrew Cainion, Landowner – Had a couple of comments regarding a letter directed to the Commission from Mr. Loverich. He asked them to look on page 4, item 4a reading, “During his attempt to get a permit for the subject property, we bid and attempted to buy the residential property at fair market value.” Mr. Cainion stated the property was never advertised. It was never set out to be sold and he did not know what the writer was trying to conclude there. Mr. Cainion wanted the Commissioners to know he had never put the property up for sale and it had never been advertised but somehow I had insulted my neighbor by not selling it to him. He had great concern that Mr. Loverich claimed there was seepage from the tanks that migrated across the road and contaminated his property. Mr. Cainion stated the property went through 4 years of remediation. He handed out a court document that concluded Mr. Cainion did not have any liability for the previous owner’s use of the land and the seepage resulting from it.

Wendy Tyner, Citizen – Represented the 28 farmers on the Island, the 19 restaurants that served locally grown food, 11 board members and 2 staff at Friends of the Farm. She thanked the Commission for allowing the public to offer their opinions and recommendations and asked if they all had the letter they had sent. She stated if you look back at the first Comp Plan that was written in 2004, there was a section that exemplified the importance of farming. She said it said in the Mission Statement that farming was important and more importantly, the Comp Plan also stated that 1% (180 acres) of public land would be devoted to farming. Thanks to the Planning Commission and City Council, there were 60 acres that were publically owned. Their goal was to continue that so they would reach the 180 acre amount. Council, Commissioners and Friends of the Farms have really strong values about the farmland heritage. It was evidenced through the 30 year lease signed through the City of Bainbridge Island supported by 100% of Council in December 2011. They wanted to encourage the Commissioners to look closely at the new Comp Plan and create a focal point for farmland preservation with a separate section isolated just to that. Some of the highlights could be to create a separate category just for agriculture, goals to acquire more public farmland or convert some existing public land into farmland. The community needs a really strong advocate that can support these ideals, Friends of the Farms being one. Another idea would be to have a Commission appointed from the City to advocate for public farmland. All of these things were important to them because of the land, the economic development, the educational opportunities, trails, wildlife corridors, open space, healthy water and the list goes on and on. She felt no one could disagree with the value of that. She welcomed the Commissioners to tour the public lands at any time offering up a Friends of the Farm board member to guide them so they could see what they had, what they have and really what they hope to have in the future. Thank you.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Commented on the NSC re-zone at Pleasant Beach. He asked if they would please consider what was already in there, incentive to have shoreline access. Lynwood Center should have had shoreline access with all those condominiums and asked that they keep the language that was there in the Special Planning Area Process to ask for public access to the water. He also stated he would be willing to go back to what the 1994 Comp Plan definitions of “shall”

and “should” were. He felt the currently suggested definitions were adding things that should not be there and it should be put back the way it was.

Dean and Shannon Dierickx, Citizens – They wanted to speak about NSC 1.2 (about the re-zoning) stating they were the property directly east of the property being proposed for re-zone emphasizing that property had been in his wife’s family for many, many years. Larson Lumber had actually been her father and grandfather. For the record, they were vehemently opposed to the zoning change because they had a single family residence right next to it. With a lot of the changes already, they had experienced some of the disruptive behavior and safety issues as well as existing traffic with more to come. They wanted to point out tonight and via e-mail that they were against the Thomas comp plan amendment. Mrs. Dierickx also pointed out that as a real estate broker on the Island, she understood change and development, but first and foremost, she was an Islander who cared about her community. Being 3rd generation and having seen quite a bit of change all quite positive, but being a residence next to something like this definitely affects the value of our home and our beach, as well. She reiterated that they had already seen some changes down there some for the good and some just change. She would like it considered that there was a residence and neighborhood next door that this would drastically affect.

Lara Hansen, EcoAdapt – Thanked the Commissioners for holding the meeting to cover many issues. She wanted to cover topic 3 on the list of bulleted items pertaining to the Comprehensive Plan. She mentioned a memorandum and track changes document Commissioners had received earlier. She wanted to remind everyone that the Comprehensive Plan was about preparing their community for the future and as they took into account the needs of the people in the community, they needed to determine how to continue to meet those needs into the future giving the change that will no doubt be part of everyone’s life. She was particularly interested in making sure they considered climate change. She felt there was a very unique opportunity in updating the Comprehensive Plan to be thoughtful about this issue which was emerging for all society to figure out how to deal with. The Comp Plan, as the road map for the coming decades, has the opportunity to help us navigate that path successfully or to become a hindrance to making good decisions. She strongly urged the Commission to take into account climate change throughout the process and in all of the chapters. One of the key components she wanted to recommend was that in the Guiding Principles section of this entire document, that considering climate change as one of those Guiding Principles was a great opportunity to allow the underlying premise that this was something the community needed to be addressing. Additionally, she felt climate change needed to be included in many places in the Environmental Element especially as an Island because there were limited places to go and come. She projected that across much of the landscape of the United States, systems would be moving. Islands make that more challenging especially one that was being slowly developed and they would have to be much more thoughtful about how they plan for that. She thanked the Commission and stated she looked forward to coming back and speaking about further Elements in the Comprehensive Plan.

Marilyn McLauchlan, Citizen – Felt the Commissioners were the last ones to really listen to the people. She spoke about the Lynwood re-zone stating she had lived there a long time. She read BIMC, “The purpose of the Neighborhood Service Center is to provide a mix of neighborhood scale; residential, commercial and service activity that is compatible with the scale, character and the intensity of the surrounding residential neighborhood and minimizes the impact of noise, odor, light, lighting, fire hazard and transportation on the neighborhood and the impact on water quality, storm water runoff and critical areas.” To her, this was the essence of re-zoning or not re-zoning.

She said they should look to their neighborhood business right there at Pleasant Beach, make it good and do what you need to do instead of re-zoning and expanding it. We are now a city, which she was against, but here they were and Pleasant Beach was a beautiful area and many of her friends were developers and to be a developer was to push the envelope. As people, we need to look at it, we need to fight it, and we need to say what we have to say. Lynwood Center always had a grocery store and the movie theater and she felt that type of atmosphere could continue. It had been beautiful to this point, but this municipal code should be adhered to. She hoped the Commissioners would read the Code and know what they were up against. She knew that if a developer were to get a hold of the Thomas property (as they should try to do), a restaurant would go there. Noise travels over the water and that would be disastrous for the environment and the peaceful neighborhood.

Mona Lydon-Rochelle, Citizen – Stated she lived two residential homes west of the proposed Thomas re-zone. She gave what she called the human nature report after looking at the Police report. She listed increasing density, traffic as an issue, lewd sex on the beach, open alcohol consumption and urination on the beach. There was a children's park right there and there were some sex offenders listed on the Police report. Ms. Lydon-Rochelle stated she felt a little emotional about this and also demoralized with what happens with development. She wanted to know what was going on because this was a neighborhood. These were families. These were children. Who wanted another big development? She didn't understand it. The whole noise factor, the negative environmental impact and she didn't feel like people were being listened to. She implored them to look at the humanitarian aspect in this never mind the negative environmental impact on that beach and estuary. There were migratory birds that come through that area that people come from all over the state to look at. It just keeps escalating in terms of the development, so she really hoped they would be reticent and thoughtful and ethical when they looked at the re-zone.

Bruce Woolever, Citizen – Spoke about the Thomas residence. He heard all the emotional comments about the ugly developer. He stated Susan Thomas owned this piece of property and back in 1994 when the NSC was first talked about, that building was commercial and had been continually in use since it was built in 1911. It was a commercial piece of property. When the NSC was done, they put 2/3 in the NSC and the other part was not in the NSC. When you talk about the emotional part that was a taking. It was a down zoning as he saw it from commercial to residential. Thank you.

2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Chair Pearl opened discussion of the S. Thomas Comprehensive Plan Amendment application by stating he was glad neighborhood citizens came to share their opinion, because he had been under the impression that no one really had opposition to the application. He felt there could be another way to resolve this zoning crossover. Commissioner Gale stated she thought the SPA process needed to be followed. Commissioner Lewars asked if the SPA process had to be done with every application that was received. Planner Sutton stated the policy was specific as to that for Rolling Bay and Island Center. The policy related to Lynwood Center reflects that an SPA has already happened and sub-area plan created and was silent as to whether it could be changed through a Comprehensive Plan Amendment versus a new sub-area plan. She continued by saying that since the Planning Commission was looking at policies as well as site specific amendments, she felt they could make a recommendation policy wise to support whichever way they chose to recommend. Commissioner Chester said he did not understand why/how a building could be divided into two

zones. Discussion of a boundary line adjustment to resolve the issue occurred. Commissioner Pearl asked if it would be problematic to develop the property as it sits in two different zones. Planner Sutton replied yes, it could theoretically be problematic.

Motion: I move that we recommend denial to the Thomas Comprehensive Plan Amendment and defer to the Special Planning Area Process for this one.
Gale/Quitslund – Passed unanimously 4-0

The Comprehensive Plan Amendment application by A. Cainion was discussed. Commissioner Lewars felt Mr. Cainion had been badly served by the City and that the language regarding Island Center with some “shalls” and a timeframe and asked for the Drafting Committee to work on it. Commissioner Quitslund stated the history of this application was something to be ashamed of. The conversation continued with arguments for the Special Planning Area process.

Motion: I move that we strengthen the policies around the Neighborhood Service Center Special Planning Process specifically page 4 of the current draft of the Land Use Element and page 11, Land Use 4.1 and 4.2.
Lewars/Chester - Passed Unanimously 4-0

Motion: I move the Commission recommend denial of the Cainion Comprehensive Plan Amendment application to change the zoning from OSR 0.4 to Neighborhood Service Center.
Lewars/Quitslund - Passed Unanimously 4-0

Commissioner Gale felt the definitions of “shall” and “should” ought to revert back to the original definitions in the 1994 Comprehensive Plan. It was decided the new definition of “shall” and the previous version of “should” would be used. Review of the changes made to the Environmental Element occurred. It was agreed the Drafting Committee would work on the topics of sea level rise and farm policies to add to the Element. Conversation continued around designated agricultural lands with input from City Consultant Joe Tovar about the City designating agricultural lands.

Commissioner Gale felt it was important to look at the submissions by the public and bring them back for discussion. Commissioner Quitslund wanted the Commission to look at what had so far been proposed in the Agricultural Lands Goal 20.

Planner Christy Carr spoke about the Agricultural Lands Inventory and its associated map. During discussion, she mentioned the publically owned Johnson Farm, which was purchased with General Fund monies, did not have any protection and was in the R-1 zone. At 14 acres, it could become 14 houses really quickly. She felt it was important for the Planning Commission to make a policy decision which would protect publically owned farm land in a consistent way, stating that was something they could do within the Comprehensive Plan.

Commissioner Gale asked if the consideration of AGR designation for City Owned land. She asked that it be put on the Drafting Committee’s agenda to bring back language about that.

Commissioner Pearl asked if anyone had any questions about the public comment from the Economic Element Workshop.

Planner Sutton clarified the direction the Commission was giving the Drafting Committee regarding EcoAdapt's comments on the Environmental Element. Commissioner Gale confirmed they would like the Drafting Committee to go over their suggestions and see where it would be appropriate to incorporate them.

Discussion continued on the public comments from the Economic Element focusing on the possible formation of an Island Utility with Commissioners Lewars and Chester against the idea.

PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Ron Peltier, Citizen – Encouraged the Commissioners to look at the power issue stating the campaign for Island Power was a way to talk about some of the issues related to our electricity and the power on the Island. When it goes to a public vote, the citizens may decide not to have our own power utility, but the campaign was part of the process and there were some issues there that might push PSE closer to making it easier to incorporate solar power. Getting PSE to work with the Island in regards to broadband. There were a number of issues and even if the Commissioners ended up not supporting Island power, he encouraged them to not just simplify it as “we just don’t want coal-fired energy.” There was a lot more to it than that. He agreed that it would be something the citizens would have an opportunity to vote on next February informing the Commissioners there would be a lot of forums for citizenry to hear the pros and cons of an Island utility. He thought that would be a good process for everyone to understand a little better issues related to power generation. Thank you.

Lara Hansen, EcoAdapt Consulting – Wanted to say two things about public power: 1) Asked the Commissioners to be cognizant in the crafting of the Comprehensive Plan language in several of the sections that the opportunity for such endeavors is left open and does not preclude such activities. Even if the community decided not to do so today, conditions may change in the future to where they would want to create a public utility. 2) Stated as a scientist that even though no, you would not know where your electrons came from, by selecting green energy and using energy that comes from something like Bonneville, which was what creating a public entity would allow the Island would do, would help decrease power costs because the power would be coming from Bonneville, you would actually be changing what the energy market was and saying we would be electing as a community that a certain percentage of the energy market was coming from a renewable energy source. You would essentially be changing the mix of what was running across those lines and moving the balance more toward renewable energy and farther away from fossil energy. No, your personal electron will not come from wind, but you would be changing that mix, decreasing greenhouse gas emissions and saving the planet for the future. Thank you.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Read this line, “The use of ‘shall’ in the policy statement does not convert it into a regulation.” He thought he knew they meant it did not automatically convert it, but once the regulations were written, you go back to policy, like the Shoreline Plan, you have the policy and then you convert that to regulation. He wanted the Commissioners to confirm that was what they meant. He stated it would convert it to a regulation if you don’t do that. Chair Pearl stated they meant that it would have to go through a process to be converted. Mr. Schmid did not feel that line did what the Commission wanted.

Wendy Tyner, Citizen – Clarified one issue as it related to the appraised value of land that had been designated for agricultural purposes. There were a myriad of ways to do that and just because

land had been designated for agricultural purposes does NOT necessarily affect the appraised value to a lower extent. It could, but it didn't necessarily mean that it would. If the land was designated to be restricted and had development rights removed in perpetuity, it may affect the appraised value, but if it was equestrian land that was near your home would actually increase the appraised value of your home. What Friends of the Farms was embarking on at the moment, was to begin a whole program of options to help private landowners conserve their land through different kinds of opportunities whether an easement, trades or selling (TDRs), they did not know yet, but they were talking to the Land Trust to partner with them to help monitor some of the lands they were looking at that might have agricultural purposes. It was not a Friends of the Farms movement now, it was a bigger movement between Bainbridge Island Land Trust, the City and Friends of the Farms.

Commissioner Quitslund mentioned the display in the lobby of City Hall of the history of agricultural lands on the Island that had come through the Historic Preservation Commission in partnership with Friends of the Farms and the City.

Ron Peltier, Citizen – Wanted to add a thought about the discussion of Island power. He felt the discussion may bring up some issues that would be appropriate to have in one of the Elements, not necessarily as an endorsement, but just as some ideas and policies that it might suggest.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48 PM.

Accepted by


J. Mack Pearl, Chair


Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

Begin:

The Planning Commission will adjourn to an executive session with legal counsel to discuss Potential Litigation pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(i). The executive session will begin at 6:00 PM, will be 1 hour long and will conclude at 7:00 PM. No action will be taken during executive session.

End:

The Planning Commission has returned from an executive session where we discussed Potential Litigation pursuant to RCW 42.30.110(1)(i). No decisions were made.

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
PLANNING COMMISSION – REGULAR MEETING
September 10, 2015



PLEASE PRINT

Name	Address	Phone/ E-Mail	Join ListServ Yes/No	Would like to speak	Subject
✓ Ron Felter				yes	Env. Element
✓ William M. Palmer	P.O. Box 6, Pt. O. 98366	wpcorsts@felchyte.net		Yes	Cannon
✓ Tom Brobst	6522 KITSAW WAY BREMERON, WA 98312	tom.brobst@pse.com			
✓ BRUCE WOOLEVER	PO Box 11649	979-5910 toilsome@aol.com		✓	Yes Thomas
✓ Susan Thomas	PO Box 132	Susan 59thomas@gmail	✓		
✓ LOYAL MOORE	4453 Pleasant Beach	Lmmuag@msn.com	✓	yes	going
✓ Ken Harrington	4471 Pleasant Beach Dr	jkhb1336@gmail.com	✓	yes	NSC - Thomas
✓ Andrea Camin	10506 NE 122	971-222-8683		YES	
✓ Wendy Tyner	122 Winslow Way W	206.842.5537		YES	FARMING
✓ Mike Carpenter	4582 Pt White	ljchmc@msn.com	✓		Thomas
✓ CHARLES SCHMID	ABC PO10999	ceschmid@att.net	✓	YES	COMP PLAN THOMAS
✓ Dean Shannon Dierickx	4541 Point White Dr. NE	206-799-0888/shannan@windermere.com	✓	YES	Traffic Beach, Prox
✓ MIKE KILLION	9551 S. Beach Dr.	206 462 8548/michaelk@cooucant	✓	NO	to res. existing yes. home
✓ Frank Gremse	10742 Sunrise Dr NE	842-9012/gremse@msn.com	✓	No	Env Element
Wendy Tyner					

PLEASE PRINT

[illegible]