EXHIBIT 13.e: Public Comment Summary

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
200 NE Moe Street | Poulsbo, Washington 98370
(360) 394-9748 | fax (360) 697-8269
www.cityofpoulsbo.com | plan&econ@cityofpoulsbo.com

MEMO

To: Planning Commission
From: Nikole Coleman, AICP, Planning Manager
Subject: Public Comment Summary – Pinnacle at Liberty Bay PRD and Preliminary Subdivision
Date: November 6, 2026

Purpose

This memorandum summarizes written public comment received during review of the Pinnacle at Liberty Bay Planned Residential Development (PRD) and Preliminary Subdivision and identifies how the principal issues raised through public comment were evaluated and addressed through technical review, project revisions, additional studies and peer review, and recommended conditions of approval. This memorandum is intended to supplement the Staff Report (Exhibit 1), Engineering/Public Works Staff Report Memo (Exhibit 1.a), and SEPA review documentation (Exhibit 12.c) and *does not replace the individual public comments or the technical findings contained in the project record*.

The complete public comment record is included in Exhibits 13.a through 13.d.

Public Comment Received

The City received 77 written public comment submissions between July 4, 2025, and November 6, 2026 (see Table 1 below). These submissions represent approximately 32 identifiable commenting parties, households, or organizations, in addition to individuals represented through multi-signature letters and petitions. Several commenters submitted multiple comments as the project progressed through technical review and as revised plans and supporting studies became available.

The number of submissions reflects individual written communications received by the City and does not represent the number of unique commenters or the number of individual concerns raised. Public comments received after the date of this memorandum will continue to be included in the project record for consideration by the applicable review authority.

Public comments addressed a broad range of issues. The primary recurring topics included:

- Traffic, roadway connectivity, and the Baywatch Court connection;
- Emergency access and fire protection;
- Construction traffic and neighborhood impacts;
- Neighborhood compatibility, density, lot size, and transitions to existing development;
- Tree removal, vegetation retention, privacy, and perimeter screening;
- Building height and impacts to neighboring properties;
- Wetlands, streams, wildlife habitat, and critical area buffers;
- Stormwater, drainage, grading, geotechnical stability, and retaining walls;
- Water, sewer, groundwater, wells, and public infrastructure capacity;
- Connections to adjacent properties;
- Archaeological and cultural resources; and
- Open space, recreation, and long-term maintenance.

The following summarizes the principal issues raised and how those issues were addressed during project review.

1. Traffic, Roadway Connectivity, Emergency Access, and Baywatch Court

Public Comment: Traffic and access were among the most frequently raised issues. Commenters expressed concern regarding additional traffic on SR 305, Sunrise Ridge Avenue NE, Crystallia Court, and surrounding neighborhood streets; the adequacy of the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA); emergency vehicle access; roadway grades; intersection safety; and reliance on a limited number of access routes. Considerable comment was also received regarding whether a roadway connection should be provided between the project and Baywatch Court NE.

Staff Response: Transportation and access issues received substantial technical review during the application process. The applicant submitted a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and subsequent revisions, which were reviewed by City Engineering staff and the City's independent transportation consultant. Review addressed traffic generation, trip distribution, intersection operations, roadway capacity, project access, and applicable transportation improvements. Additional transportation analysis and final TIA revisions are required through the recommended conditions of approval.

Separate from the general traffic analysis, the City evaluated roadway connectivity, emergency access, and consistency with the City's adopted transportation network. The City Engineer and Fire Code Official determined that the proposed roadway configuration, without a connection to Baywatch Court NE, does not fully satisfy applicable subdivision connectivity and emergency access requirements.

The City retained Parametrix to independently evaluate the feasibility of the Baywatch Court connection. The September 16, 2026, review concluded that a connection can feasibly be designed based upon reasonable preliminary engineering assumptions. The review does not constitute final engineering or environmental approval of the connection.

Accordingly, the recommended Engineering conditions of approval require design, permitting, and construction of the Baywatch Court connection, identified as planned roadway NR-12, to the applicable residential collector standard. The connection is required to satisfy roadway connectivity, circulation, and emergency access requirements and must be completed in accordance with the approved phasing requirements, including construction with the first division.

Final design will require supplemental engineering, geotechnical, hydraulic, stormwater, critical area, and structural analysis, together with applicable agency permits and mitigation. The Engineering conditions also address the required Sunrise Ridge Avenue/NR-13 improvements and provision for feasible future connectivity to adjoining properties.

Staff finds that the transportation and access issues identified through public comment can be addressed through the recommended conditions of approval and SEPA mitigation measures.

Addressed Through: Staff Report transportation, preliminary subdivision, PRD, and Public Comment findings; Engineering Staff Report dated November 5, 2026; Engineering recommended conditions of approval; Planning COAs P12 and P51; Traffic Impact Analysis and independent transportation peer reviews (Exhibits 9.a–9.f); Parametrix Connection Road Feasibility Independent Review (Exhibit 9.g); Fire District and Fire Code Official memoranda (Exhibits 9.o–9.p); Engineering Connectivity Memorandum (Exhibit 9.q); and Engineering SEPA Memorandum (Exhibit 12.c.ii).

2. Construction Traffic and Neighborhood Impacts

Public Comment: Commenters expressed concern regarding construction vehicles using existing neighborhood streets, truck traffic, dust, debris, noise, parking, roadway damage, and temporary impacts to residents during the multi-phase construction period.

Staff Response: Construction-related impacts will be addressed through the recommended conditions of approval, SEPA mitigation, and subsequent grading and civil construction permits. These requirements address construction sequencing, temporary traffic control, erosion and sediment control, dust management, construction access, roadway protection, and other measures intended to reduce impacts on surrounding residential neighborhoods.

Engineering COA E48 establishes specific construction traffic restrictions. Construction truck traffic originating from the Sunrise Ridge Avenue NE construction entrance shall use Johnson Parkway to access SR 305 and shall not travel north on Sunrise Ridge Avenue NE. Construction truck traffic on NE Crystallia Court shall be limited to

construction activities in the immediate vicinity of the cul-de-sac and shall not use that roadway as a general project construction entrance.

The applicant is required to prepare and implement a construction traffic management plan incorporating these restrictions and applicable City requirements. Construction activities will remain subject to City inspection, enforcement, and applicable construction permit conditions.

Addressed Through: Staff Report construction impacts and Public Comment sections; Engineering COA E48 and applicable grading, erosion control, and construction conditions; SEPA mitigation measures (Exhibit 12.c); and subsequent grading and civil construction permit review.

3. Neighborhood Compatibility, Density, Lot Size, and Transition to Crystal View

Public Comment: Numerous comments addressed the relationship between the proposed development and the existing Crystal View neighborhood. Concerns included smaller proposed lot sizes, increased residential density, proximity of new homes to existing residences, and whether the project provides an appropriate transition between the PRD and surrounding development.

Staff Response: These concerns were evaluated under the Planned Residential Development standards, particularly PMC 18.260.070(A), which requires consistency with the existing single-family residential environment at the adjacent perimeter. The PRD regulations allow flexibility in lot dimensions and development configuration, subject to compliance with the applicable design and compatibility requirements.

During technical review, the applicant revised aspects of lot configuration, building placement, landscaping, screening, and open space. Staff evaluated the overall physical and visual relationship between the proposed development and adjacent Crystal View residences, including housing type, lot configuration and spacing, building scale, setbacks, retained vegetation, and intervening open-space tracts. The proposal consists of detached single-family residences, and portions of the perimeter incorporate intervening tracts and physical separation between proposed lots and existing residences.

The applicable PRD standards do not require proposed lots to duplicate the dimensions of lots in adjoining subdivisions. Consistent with the City's administrative interpretations of PMC 18.260.070(A), staff evaluated the overall development design and its relationship to the existing single-family residential environment rather than relying upon lot dimensions alone. Perimeter landscaping, fencing, and buffering were also evaluated under the separate screening requirements of PMC 18.260.070(B).

The recommended conditions of approval establish requirements for final landscaping, tree retention and protection, perimeter fencing, and residential architectural design. Based upon the revised plans, applicable administrative interpretations, and recommended conditions of approval, staff finds that the proposal satisfies the applicable PRD standards governing density, lot configuration, perimeter treatment, and neighborhood compatibility.

Addressed Through: Staff Report PRD Site Design Criteria (PMC 18.260.070), PRD approval findings, and Public Comment section; Planning COAs P13–P24 (tree retention and protection), P26–P29 and P32 (landscaping and maintenance), P40–P42 (residential architectural design), and P43 (perimeter fencing); Administrative Interpretations Nos. 1–3 (Exhibits 14.a–14.c); revised preliminary subdivision plans; Preliminary Landscape, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (Exhibit 3.a); and Individual Identity Plan (Exhibit 4).

4. Trees, Vegetation, Privacy, and Perimeter Screening

Public Comment: Commenters raised concerns regarding removal of mature trees, loss of existing vegetative screening, impacts to wildlife habitat, privacy between existing and proposed residences, and the time required for replacement landscaping to mature.

Staff Response: Tree retention and perimeter screening were evaluated through the applicant's Tree Retention Plan, supporting arborist documentation, independent City arborist review, and revised landscape and open-space plans. The revised Tree Retention Plan identifies approximately 840 healthy significant trees for retention, exceeding the minimum retention required under PMC Chapter 18.180.

Staff recognizes that removal of existing mature vegetation will change the appearance of portions of the site and that newly installed landscaping will require time to mature. The project therefore incorporates retained vegetation, permanent open-space and tree-retention tracts, supplemental landscaping, setbacks, and perimeter fencing to provide separation and screening between existing and proposed residences.

Conditions of approval require implementation of the approved Tree Retention Plan, installation and maintenance of tree protection measures during construction, arborist oversight and follow-up assessment, final landscape and irrigation plans, and installation of six-foot-high sight-obscuring perimeter fencing. Additional conditions establish long-term protection and maintenance responsibilities for retained trees, landscaping, and open-space tracts.

Staff finds that the revised proposal, subject to the recommended conditions, complies with the applicable tree retention and landscaping requirements. Perimeter screening is also evaluated under PMC 18.260.070(B), separate from the neighborhood consistency requirements of PMC 18.260.070(A).

Addressed Through: Staff Report tree retention, landscaping, PRD site design criteria, and Public Comment sections; Planning COAs P13–P25 (tree retention and protection), P26–P29 and P32 (landscaping), P43 (perimeter fencing), and P63–P65 and P68 (long-term protection and maintenance); Tree Retention Plan (Exhibit 7.a); City arborist peer reviews (Exhibits 7.b–7.c); and Preliminary Landscape, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (Exhibit 3.a).

5. Building Height, Privacy, and Views

Public Comment: Comments raised concerns regarding the height of proposed residences, particularly three-story homes located near existing Crystal View residences, as well as potential privacy and view impacts.

Staff Response: Building height, setbacks, and residential design were evaluated under the applicable RL zoning and Planned Residential Development standards. The proposal consists of detached single-family residences, and future homes must comply with the applicable development standards, including building height, setbacks, and lot coverage.

The applicant submitted an Individual Identity Plan establishing a framework for architectural variety through different home models, elevations, roof forms, building massing, and exterior treatments. Conditions require compliance with the approved Individual Identity Plan, prohibit identical home elevations on consecutive lots, and require continued tracking of architectural variety during building permit review.

Staff recognizes that development of the site may change existing views and privacy conditions for adjoining residences. The City's development regulations do not establish a general requirement to preserve private territorial views. Accordingly, staff evaluated these concerns through the applicable height, setback, PRD neighborhood compatibility, landscaping, and perimeter screening requirements.

Final compliance with building height, setbacks, lot coverage, and other applicable residential development standards will be verified through individual building permit review.

Addressed Through: Staff Report RL zoning, PRD site design criteria, architectural variety, and Public Comment sections; Planning COAs P40–P42 (individual home design and architectural variety), P43 (perimeter fencing), and P66 (building permit review of height, setbacks, and other development standards); Individual Identity Plan (Exhibit 4); revised preliminary plat; and Preliminary Landscape, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (Exhibit 3.a).

6. Wetlands, Streams, Wildlife Habitat, and Critical Areas

Public Comment: Commenters, including the Suquamish Tribe, raised concerns regarding wetlands, streams, fish and wildlife habitat, buffer widths, stream classifications, vegetation removal, and potential impacts associated with roadway and utility construction.

Staff Response: Critical areas received extensive technical review throughout the application process. The applicant submitted a Critical Areas Report and Habitat Management Plan, subsequent addenda, revised plans, and supporting engineering and environmental documentation. These materials were independently reviewed on behalf of the City, including the October 14, 2026, Grette Associates peer review (Exhibit 5.h).

The review resulted in revisions to stream classifications, buffer widths, critical area boundaries, habitat protection measures, and associated development plans. Barrante's Creek (Stream C) was classified as a Type F stream with a 150-foot buffer, while Streams B and D were classified as Type Ns1. The applicant revised the preliminary plans and critical area documentation to reflect these determinations.

Additional evaluation remains necessary for certain proposed improvements affecting streams and associated buffers, including the Stream A utility crossing, Stream D stormwater outfall, and required Baywatch Court NE/NR-12 roadway connection across Stream C. Conditions require supplemental site-specific critical area and

engineering analysis, avoidance and minimization measures, mitigation and restoration plans, independent peer review, and applicable agency permits before the affected construction activities may be authorized.

Preliminary subdivision approval does not constitute final approval of these improvements or authorize critical area disturbance. Additional conditions establish requirements for critical area protection, notices to title, construction fencing, signage, and restrictions affecting individual residential lots.

Based upon the revised technical documentation, independent peer review, and recommended conditions, staff finds that the proposal can comply with the applicable critical area regulations, subject to completion of the required supplemental review and permitting.

Addressed Through: Staff Report Critical Areas, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas, and Public Comment sections; Planning COAs P12 (Baywatch connection), P44–P50 (critical area protection and development restrictions), and P51–P52 (supplemental critical area review); Engineering COA E52; Critical Areas Report and Habitat Management Plan and addenda (Exhibit 5); Grette Associates independent peer reviews, including Exhibit 5.h; Suquamish Tribe comments; and Parametrix Baywatch Connection Road Feasibility Independent Review (Exhibit 9.g).

7. Stormwater, Drainage, Grading, Geotechnical Conditions, and Retaining Walls

Public Comment: Comments raised concerns regarding stormwater runoff, erosion, drainage onto neighboring properties, steep slopes, grading, slope stability, retaining-wall height and safety, and the overall scale of earthwork necessary to develop the site.

Staff Response: The applicant submitted stormwater, geotechnical, grading, and civil engineering documentation that was reviewed by City Engineering staff and independent technical consultants. During technical review, the applicant revised grading, roadway, drainage, and retaining-wall plans in response to City and consultant comments.

The revised retaining-wall design eliminates the previously proposed 35-foot walls and identifies proposed wall heights generally ranging up to approximately 10 to 12 feet, with walls within individual lot building setbacks limited to a maximum height of six feet. The geotechnical evaluations support the feasibility of the proposed wall system, subject to final engineering, construction-level review, and implementation of applicable geotechnical recommendations.

Conditions require final grading, stormwater, roadway, utility, and retaining-wall plans to incorporate the approved geotechnical recommendations. Additional geotechnical evaluation is required if final designs materially differ from those previously evaluated. Retaining walls must be professionally engineered, and final plans must address wall drainage, slope stability, construction sequencing, pedestrian fall protection, and other applicable safety requirements.

The applicant must also establish retaining-wall ownership, maintenance, inspection, repair, replacement, and access responsibilities. Appropriate property rights and easements must be obtained for retaining walls affecting adjoining properties. Stormwater facilities remain subject to applicable City engineering and stormwater requirements, including treatment, flow control, erosion and sediment control, and long-term maintenance.

Preliminary subdivision approval does not constitute approval of construction-level engineering plans. Final plans will undergo additional City review before construction authorization.

Addressed Through: Staff Report Earth, Stormwater, Geologically Hazardous Areas, Engineering, and Public Comment sections; Planning COAs P10 (property rights for boundary retaining walls) and P53–P61 (geotechnical design, grading, retaining-wall engineering, ownership, maintenance, and fall protection); applicable Engineering stormwater, grading, and retaining-wall conditions, including E49 and E56–E58; Stormwater Report; geotechnical reports, addenda, and independent peer reviews (Exhibit 6); Retaining Wall Design and Maintenance Response (Exhibit 3.b); and revised civil and grading plans.

8. Water, Sewer, Groundwater, Wells, and Public Infrastructure

Public Comment: Commenters questioned whether existing water, sewer, emergency services, and other public infrastructure can accommodate the development. Comments also addressed groundwater and potential effects on existing wells.

Staff Response: The proposed development was reviewed by City Public Works, Engineering, utility providers, Kitsap Public Health District, and other applicable agencies. Public Works has determined that the City presently has sufficient water supply to serve the development, subject to verification of water availability at the time of individual building permit applications.

The project includes water-system looping and other utility improvements required through the Public Works and Engineering conditions of approval. Final utility design, system capacity, fire flow, and construction-level infrastructure requirements will be reviewed through subsequent engineering and permitting processes.

Review also identified an existing public water-system well with a sanitary control radius affecting Lots 46–49. Planning COA P62 requires the applicant or property owner to demonstrate compliance with Kitsap Public Health District requirements before issuance of building permits for those lots. The final plat must identify the applicable restriction, and no building permit may be issued for an affected lot until the City receives documentation from Kitsap Public Health District confirming that the restriction has been resolved.

Staff finds that the proposed development can be served by the necessary public infrastructure, subject to the required improvements, final design review, capacity verification, and applicable conditions of approval.

Addressed Through: Staff Report Public Facilities, Utilities, Groundwater, and Public Comment sections; Planning COA P62 (wellhead protection and building permit restrictions for Lots 46–49); applicable Public Works and Engineering conditions of approval; water-system analysis and peer review; Kitsap Public Health District comments; and revised preliminary utility and civil plans.

9. Connections to Adjacent Properties

Public Comment: An adjoining property owner requested that the project provide a future roadway connection to property south of the project site. Additional comments addressed whether the subdivision adequately accommodates future connectivity to adjoining undeveloped properties.

Staff Response: The City evaluated potential roadway connections to adjoining undeveloped properties as part of its review of subdivision connectivity and the requirements of PMC 17.80.060.

In response to City review and public comment, the applicant submitted separate feasibility evaluations addressing potential roadway connections to the Divoky and Skelley properties (Exhibits 9.j and 9.k). These evaluations considered site topography, roadway grades, intersection configuration, sight distance, and applicable engineering standards.

The City reviewed these materials in conjunction with the preliminary roadway and subdivision plans. Engineering COA E51 requires the development to provide for a future street connection to adjoining parcel 252601-2-034-2002. The final roadway and subdivision design must incorporate the applicable connectivity requirements established through Engineering review.

Staff finds that the proposed subdivision, subject to the Engineering conditions of approval, addresses the applicable requirements for future roadway connectivity to adjacent properties.

Addressed Through: Staff Report transportation, subdivision connectivity, and Public Comment sections; Engineering COA E51 (future street connection to adjacent parcel 252601-2-034-2002); Divoky Connection Feasibility Letter (Exhibit 9.j); Skelley Connection Feasibility Letter (Exhibit 9.k); Engineering roadway connectivity review (Exhibit 9.q); and revised preliminary subdivision and civil plans.

10. Archaeological and Cultural Resources

Public Comment: The Suquamish Tribe identified ethnographic place names associated with the area, noted that the site is within an area identified as having archaeological sensitivity, and requested archaeological review before extensive ground disturbance occurs.

Staff Response: Staff considered the Suquamish Tribe's comments regarding archaeological sensitivity, ethnographic place names, and the potential for cultural resources to be encountered during development. Although archaeological resources have not been identified on the site to date, the site's moderate archaeological sensitivity and the extent of proposed ground disturbance warrant additional investigation before construction.

Planning COA P11 requires completion of a professional archaeological survey prepared by a qualified archaeologist before issuance of a grading permit or other approval authorizing ground-disturbing activity.

The condition also establishes inadvertent discovery procedures. If archaeological materials or human remains are encountered during construction, work in the immediate area must stop, the area must be secured, and the City, Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation, and affected Tribes must be notified. Work may not resume in the affected area until authorized by the City in consultation with the appropriate agencies and Tribes. Additional investigation, monitoring, or other measures may be required based on the discovery.

These requirements address the archaeological and cultural resource concerns identified during project review and provide for additional investigation and protection before and during ground-disturbing activities.

Addressed Through: Staff Report Archaeological and Cultural Resources, Public Comment, and SEPA sections; Planning COA P11 (professional archaeological survey and inadvertent discovery procedures); Suquamish Tribe comments; and SEPA environmental review

11. Open Space, Recreation, and Long-Term Maintenance

Public Comment: Comments questioned the amount and usability of proposed open space and recreational amenities and how those areas, landscaping, private infrastructure, and other common facilities will be maintained over time.

Staff Response: The proposed Planned Residential Development provides open space exceeding the minimum required under PMC Chapter 18.260. The preliminary plans identify a coordinated system of permanent open-space tracts, retained vegetation, pedestrian pathways, and recreational amenities distributed throughout the development.

Conditions of approval require detailed recreational amenity plans, final landscape and irrigation plans, and an Open Space and Recreational Amenity Phasing Plan. The phasing plan must identify the location, type, acreage, ownership, construction schedule, and maintenance responsibilities for required open space and recreational amenities. Each development phase must independently or cumulatively provide the open space and recreational amenities necessary to serve that phase.

Required recreational amenities must be installed, inspected, and approved in conjunction with the applicable development phase, unless alternative timing is approved by the Planning and Economic Development Director consistent with the conditions of approval.

The project will establish a homeowners' association responsible for the long-term ownership and maintenance of applicable common open-space tracts, tree-retention areas, landscaping, recreational amenities, and other designated improvements. Conditions require these responsibilities to be identified through final plat provisions and recorded Covenants, Conditions, and Restrictions. Natural open-space areas and retained trees will remain subject to applicable protection and maintenance requirements.

Staff finds that the proposal satisfies the applicable PRD open-space and recreational amenity requirements, subject to final plan approval, phased installation, and implementation of the required long-term maintenance provisions.

Addressed Through: Staff Report PRD open-space and recreational amenity findings and Public Comment section; Planning COAs P33–P39 (recreational amenity design, installation, phasing, and maintenance), P63–P65 and P68 (HOA responsibilities and protection of open-space and tree-retention tracts), and P69–P73 (CC&Rs); Preliminary Landscape, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (Exhibit 3.a); and Infrastructure Phasing Plan.

Conclusion

Public comment received throughout review of the Pinnacle at Liberty Bay application identified a broad range of concerns that were considered as part of the City's technical, environmental, and land use review. In several instances, public comments raised issues also identified by City staff, reviewing agencies, or independent technical consultants and contributed to requests for additional information, independent peer review, revisions to project plans, and recommended conditions of approval.

Examples include additional transportation analysis and independent engineering review of the Baywatch Court NE/NR-12 connection; revisions to roadway configurations, grading, retaining walls, landscaping, and critical area plans; additional tree-retention and perimeter-screening measures; evaluation of neighborhood compatibility and transitions to adjacent residential development; review of potential roadway connections to adjoining properties;

restrictions associated with the existing public water-system well; and the requirement for a professional archaeological survey before ground disturbance.

The City's review also identified requirements that must be satisfied through subsequent permitting and construction-level review. Most notably, the recommended conditions require the Baywatch Court NE/NR-12 roadway connection to address transportation connectivity and emergency access requirements. Additional engineering, critical area analysis, mitigation, independent peer review, and applicable agency permits will be required before construction of the connection and certain other improvements affecting streams and associated buffers may be authorized. Preliminary subdivision approval does not constitute approval of final construction plans or authorization of outstanding critical area impacts.

Not every concern raised through public comment resulted in a modification to the proposal. Where an issue is governed by adopted development standards, including permitted density, PRD lot dimensional flexibility, neighborhood compatibility, building height, and private views, staff evaluated the proposal against the applicable approval criteria rather than imposing requirements not established by the Poulsbo Municipal Code.

Based upon the complete application record, revised project plans, technical studies, independent peer reviews, agency coordination, public comments, and SEPA review, staff recommends approval of the Pinnacle at Liberty Bay Planned Residential Development and Preliminary Subdivision, subject to the conditions of approval identified in the Staff Report (Exhibit 1). These conditions establish the additional design, mitigation, technical review, permitting, construction, and long-term maintenance requirements necessary to demonstrate compliance with applicable development regulations and address identified project impacts.

Table 1: Public Comment Received (as of November 6, 2026)

Commenter	Date	Media	Exhibit
Crystal View Neighborhood	7/4/25	Letter	13.a
Tracie Hannah	8/25/25	Email	13.a
Kathleen Hamlin	8/28/25	Email	13.a
Ann Holt	8/28/25	Email	13.a
Terrie Lumsden	8/29/25	Email	13.a
Brian and Gayla Walsh	9/1/25	Letter	13.a
Rowell Matt and Gary Casey	9/1/25	Letter	13.a
Taylor Harriman, Suquamish Tribe	9/3/25	Email	13.a
Rowell Matt and Gary Casey	9/4/25	Email	13.a
Kathleen Hamlin	9/4/25	Email	13.a
John Warwood	9/5/25	Letter	13.a
Leigh Hwa	9/7/25	Email	13.a
Suwei Chen	9/7/25	Email	13.a
Bruce Brockett	9/8/25	Email	13.a
Ryan Schlyper	9/8/25	Email	13.a
Multiple Signatures	9/8/25	Letter	13.a
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	9/8/25	Letter	13.a
Katie Mooney	9/9/25	Email	13.a
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	9/9/25	Letter	13.a
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	9/10/25	Letter	13.a
Kathleen Hamlin	9/10/25	Email	13.a
Lee-Ann Cmrie	9/10/25	Email	13.a
Joan E. Lockyear	9/13/25	Email	13.a
Andrew Hitchings	9/13/25	Email	13.a
Andrea Baldonada	9/13/25	Letter	13.a

Dana Womack	9/12/25	Email	13.b
Glynis Casey	9/12/25	Email	13.b
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	9/16/25	Email	13.b
Craig Divoky	10/8/25	Email	13.b
Rod Malcolm, Suquamish Tribe	12/25/25	Email	13.b
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	1/31/26	Letter	13.b
Rowell Matt and Gary Casey	2/9/26	Letter	13.b
John and Christine Warwood	2/12/26	Letter	13.b
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	3/10/26	Letter	13.b
Andrea Baldonada	Unknown	Letter	13.b
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	5/18/26	Letter	13.b
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	6/2/26	Letter	13.b
Leigh Hwa	6/17/26	Email	13.c
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	6/18/26	Letter	13.c
Bruce Brockett	6/18/26	Email	13.c
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	6/22/26	Letter	13.c
Lee-Ann Comrie	6/23/26	Letter	13.c
John Warwood	6/23/26	Letter	13.c
Scott and Mary Kay Magraw	6/25/26	Letter	13.c
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	6/25/26	Letter	13.c
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	6/28/26	Letter	13.c
Andrew Hitchings	6/28/26	Email	13.c
Josh and San Powers	Unknown	Letter	13.c
Rowell Matt	6/29/26	Email	13.c
Andrew Hitchings	6/29/26	Email	13.c
Andrew Hitchings	6/29/26	Email	13.c
Michael Dicus	6/29/26	Email	13.c
Dana and Katharine Lockhart	6/29/26	Letter	13.c
Kathleen Hamlin	6/29/26	Email	13.c
Dana Womack	6/29/26	Letter	13.c
Craig Bailey	6/30/26	Email	13.c
Andrew Hitchings	6/30/26	Email	13.c
Andrew Hitchings	6/30/26	Email	13.c
Andrew Hitchings	6/30/26	Email	13.c
Michael Thelan and Barbara Zingg	6/30/26	Letter	13.c
Katie Oertli Mooney	7/1/26	Letter	13.c
Kevin Whitehall	7/2/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/10/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/15/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/20/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/20/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/28/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/29/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/29/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	7/30/26	Email	13.d

Andrew Hitchings	8/3/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	8/6/26	Email	13.d
Tracey and John Langley	8/6/26	Letter	13.d
Multiple – Peition	Unknown	Letter	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	8/13/26	Email	13.d
Andrew Hitchings	9/28/26	Email	13.d
Leigh Hwa	9/29/26	Email	13.d