



Kitsap County Department of Community Development

2025 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan Update
Planning Commission Public Comment Response Matrix

Comments Received Through April 19, 2025

This Comment Response Matrix includes public comments received to date. The comments are organized by commenter, summary of comments received, and Department response. Column one is the number of the comment. Column two indicates the name and organization, if applicable, of the commenter. The Summary of Comment column includes a summary of each public comment. The Department Response column indicates whether a change to the proposed code amendment is recommended and associated rationale. The full written comment letters will be transmitted to the Planning Commission.

Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS				
#	Name (Org)	Type	Summary of Comment	Staff Response (Changes Made <u>OR</u> No Changes Made.)
1	Kitsap Environmental Coalition	Email Attachment	2025 PROS Plan is not an update of and is not built on the foundation of the 2018 PROS Plan as an update would be expected to do. It seems to redirect the focus and goals and is not clear what is going to be implemented and who takes responsibility for it.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The 2025 PROS Plan carries forward many of the themes in the 2018 PROS Plan – it also includes an updated inventory analysis, demand and need analysis, public engagement, and capital program, as required by Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The 2025 PROS Plan reorganizes the goals to better align with Department operations and to ensure that they are representative of all program areas of the Department.
“	“	“	Goals are not clearly defined and do not align with Chapter 6 (Parks Element) of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan. Draft goals have no headings and it is difficult to understand their alignment with Chapter 6 or the 2018 PROS Plan.	No change. The Parks Department submitted a PROS Plan and Comprehensive Plan consistency review to the Department of Community Development (DCD) and DCD staff determined that the PROS Plan is consistent with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan. The themes and topics from both the 2018 PROS Plan and 2024 Comprehensive Plan are represented in the 2025 PROS Plan’s goals and objectives, though they have been organized to align with the Department’s program areas.
“	“	“	PROS Plan is unnecessarily lengthy with considerable irrelevant information that clouds the focus of the plan.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The 2025 PROS Plan follows the RCO’s preferred format for PROS Plans and is in compliance with the required elements as described in RCO’s Manual 2: Planning Guidelines.

“	“	“	Design, analysis, and reporting of the survey is poorly done – leading questions, no questions regarding policy issues. PROS Plan does not clearly present the data and its meaning.	No change. The three public surveys were designed to build on one another and to develop capital projects and were not policy based. The goals and objectives were based on themes from all engagement conducted throughout the plan development process, as well as carrying forward many of the themes from the goals and objectives of the 2018 PROS Plan.
“	“	“	PROS Plan schedule is delayed, and public has only seen the draft one time – compared to approach for Year of the Rural and 2024 Comprehensive Plan where there is/was public review at multiple stages. Parks Department is presenting this draft as a “final draft” – it should be treated as a 60% developed draft.	No change. While the Draft PROS Plan was released for one public comment period, it is based on extensive community engagement.
“	“	“	Suggest the Planning Commission recommend to BOCC that the PROS Plan be revised to have clear and concise language that supports the 2024 Comprehensive Plan and 2018 PROS Plan. Goals, policies, and strategies should be derived from these plans.	No change. The 2025 PROS Plan supports the 2018 PROS Plan by carrying forward many of the themes within the 2018 Plan and the PROS Plan was determined to be consistent with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan.
“	“	“	Suggest the PROS Plan not be adopted by reference into the Comprehensive Plan, but rather it be a reference document for the Comprehensive Plan. Focus on a high-quality revision to Chapter 6 with goals, strategies, and actions that are similarly framed and detailed as the rest of the Comprehensive Plan.	No change. The Parks Department recommends that the PROS Plan be incorporated by reference into the Comprehensive Plan. This approach is supported by DCD. The Parks Department is not proposing changes to Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Plan.
“	“	“	Suggest PROS Plan be congruent with its original intent as being an update of the 2018 PROS Plan.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The 2025 PROS Plan carries forward many of the themes in the 2018 PROS Plan – it also includes an updated inventory analysis, demand and need analysis, public engagement, and capital program, as required by Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The 2025 PROS Plan reorganizes the goals to better align with Department operations and to ensure that they are representative of all program areas of the Department.

2	Joseph Lubischer	Email	<p>The concept of heritage parks came about in 1998-2000, followed by purchases of large tracts of land – intended to provide recreation, but importantly were large enough to protect wildlife and habitat. 2025 PROS Plan is a complete replacement of the 2018 PROS Plan – which was a solid plan and included three important elements for heritage parks.</p> <p><i>(Each one is discussed in greater detail in the rows that follow)</i></p>	<p>No change. Comment previously addressed. The 2025 PROS Plan carries forward many of the themes in the 2018 PROS Plan – it also includes an updated inventory analysis, demand and need analysis, public engagement, and capital program, as required by Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The 2025 PROS Plan reorganizes the goals to better align with Department operations and to ensure that they are representative of all program areas of the Department.</p>
“	“	“	<p>The County recognized that it did not have the resources or staff to manage the heritage parks and began creating stewardship groups to fill this need. Stewardship group model was successful, but since 2021, stewardship groups have been marginalized by Parks Department and a number of stewards have moved on. The PROS Plan would abandon stewardship groups and engagement and view stewards as volunteers managed by maintenance staff.</p>	<p>No change. Comment previously addressed. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for Parks Department programs, such as the volunteer program.</p>
“	“	“	<p>2018 PROS Plan included emphasis on protecting wildlife and habitat. 2025 PROS Plan apparently places more importance on greater access and development – there needs to be recognition that protecting and repairing ecosystems is a prime desire of the community and that quality habitat will make for quality recreation.</p>	<p>No change. Conservation and landscape resilience emerged as a key theme from community engagement, and this is reflected in the body of the PROS Plan, Goal 2 and its subsequent objectives and actions, Goal 3 and Objective 3.2, and the Conservation and Landscape Resilience projects in the CFP.</p>
“	“	“	<p>Appropriate planning protocol is vital (assess resource and ecological assets, determine appropriate land use, and identify restoration and development activities). Upcoming plans are needed for Coulter Creek Heritage Park and Eglon Forest. 2018 PROS Plan had a protocol for planning; 2025 PROS Plan has one paragraph. 2018 protocol should not be abandoned.</p>	<p>No change. Comment previously addressed. The Department agrees with the sequence of planning steps identified in this comment. The PROS Plan provides guidance and direction for park planning and development (see Objective 3.2) and an overview of the park planning process and how the Department intends to use it has been added into the Park Classification section.</p>
“	“	“	<p>Carrying capacity of heritage parks – needs to be studied and have limitations on access, parking, trail locations and mileage.</p>	<p>No change. Comment previously addressed. Parking lot projects will be sized and located appropriately based on a park’s intended usage and park management plan, which will be developed with community input.</p>

“	“	“	Stewardship groups had little cost to the Department, which is projected to lose 2-5 FTEs in 2026. There is no Plan B.	No change – out of scope of the PROS Plan.
“	“	“	Meaningful community participation and engagement – hasn't that always been a desirable feature of county government?	No change.
“	“	“	E-bikes and other alternately powered mobility devices are an issue that should be addressed in the PROS Plan.	No change. Comment previously addressed. E-bikes will be addressed when the Department updates the Park Code (KCC 10.12).
“	“	“	The fixed schedule for the approval of the proposed PROS Plan should be disregarded. The public has not had any opportunity to participate or comment on policy-level issues until the final draft was recently released.	No change. The 2025 PROS Plan included many opportunities for public involvement including surveys, public open house workshops, stakeholder interviews, and a 5-week public comment period on the draft plan.
“	“	“	2025 PROS Plan needs to be comprehensive and have specifics. Abandoning the 2018 PROS Plan has not proved to be a good strategy – leaves the Planning Commission with the difficult task of changing course.	No change. The 2018 PROS Plan was not “abandoned,” but rather, built upon.

3	Kitsap Environmental Coalition	Email Attachment	The 2025 PROS Plan would significantly limit public involvement and diminishes protection of nature – it ignores public priority of natural areas in favor of recreational facilities and makes unilateral decisions without public input.	No change. The 2025 PROS Plan does not limit public involvement and does not favor recreational facilities over natural areas. Based on results from public engagement, the 2025 PROS Plan recognizes the need for both, and this is displayed in the Goals and Objectives and Capital Improvements sections.
“	“	“	The PROS Plan shifts goals and objectives from the 2018 PROS Plan and the 2024 Comprehensive Plan to ones that have been determined by the Parks Department and focused on their current staff activities.	No change. The goals were developed based on community engagement during the public participation process. Additionally, the goals have been reorganized to align with Department operations and to ensure that they are representative of all program areas of the Department. The goals and objectives do carry forward many of the themes from the 2018 PROS Plan and have been determined to be consistent with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan.
“	“	“	The PROS Plan changes the heritage park stewardship groups to individual volunteers with reduced roles managed by Operations and Management staff.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for Parks Department programs, such as the volunteer program.
“	“	“	The PROS Plan changes the park classification system without input from the public.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The public comment period provided an opportunity to capture community input on the PROS Plan, including the proposed updates to the park classifications. Parks Department staff met with members of Kitsap Environmental Coalition to discuss park classifications and Parks staff made changes to the PROS Plan to provide clarification around park planning and park classifications.
“	“	“	The PROS Plan fails to prioritize and plan for protecting nature and wildlife. Development is occurring before adequate assessments of wildlife and ecology are completed.	No change. Conservation and landscape resilience emerged as a key theme from community engagement, and this is reflected in the body of the PROS Plan, Goal 2 and its subsequent objectives and actions, Goal 3 and Objective 3.2, and the Conservation and Landscape Resilience projects in the CFP. The overview of the planning process in the Park Classification section and in Objective 3.2, which calls for environmental assessments ahead of park development.

“	“	“	Comment responses reiterate what is in the plan rather than responding to the comment.	No change.
“	“	“	<p>Suggest that County Administrator and BOCC establish that the Parks Department collaboratively engage with the public to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Build relationships that are based on a vision and goals that prioritize nature (b) Include public engagement that supports broad public stewardship of Parks lands (c) Diminish constraining rules and regulations 	No change – out of scope of the PROS Plan.
“	“	“	Suggest making a clear link between goals in the 2018 PROS Plan and the 2024 Comprehensive Plan.	No change. The Parks Department submitted a PROS Plan and Comprehensive Plan consistency review to the Department of Community Development (DCD) and DCD staff determined that the PROS Plan is consistent with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan. The themes and topics from both the 2018 PROS Plan and 2024 Comprehensive Plan are represented in the 2025 PROS Plan's goals and objectives, they have just been organized to align with the Department's program areas.
“	“	“	Suggest working with stewardship groups to formulate guidelines for the work of such groups under the PROS Plan.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for Parks Department programs, such as the volunteer program.
“	“	“	Suggest establishing process for public involvement around park classification updates.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The public comment period provided an opportunity to capture community input on the PROS Plan, including the proposed updates to the park classifications. Parks Department staff met with members of Kitsap Environmental Coalition to discuss park classifications and Parks staff made changes to the PROS Plan to provide clarification around park planning and park classifications.

“	“	“	Suggest providing a clear template for park master plans that has consistent vision, standards, and planning with attention to landscape classifications that can be carried out across the system.	No change. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for the Parks Department, such as developing a park master plan process.
“	“	“	Suggest enlisting volunteers to assist planning staff to revise the public involvement section of the plan.	No change.
“	“	“	Suggest responding to comments about desired changes instead of reiterating what is in the plan.	No change. Responding to comments with information from the PROS Plan is intended to show the commentor their concern is already addressed in the Plan.
“	“	“	Suggest removing extensive irrelevant information in the Draft PROS Plan and format it along the lines of the 2018 PROS Plan.	No change. Comment previously addressed. The 2025 PROS Plan follows the RCO's preferred format for PROS Plans and is in compliance with the required elements as described in RCO's Manual 2: Planning Guidelines.
“	“	“	Suggest retaining Chapter 6 of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan with modifications as needed (opposed to replacing Chapter 6 with the PROS Plan).	No change. The Parks Department recommends that the PROS Plan be incorporated by reference into the Comprehensive Plan. This approach is supported by DCD. The Parks Department is not proposing changes to Chapter 6 of the Comprehensive Plan.

“	“	“	Suggest providing parks planner resources needed to make a high-quality PROS Plan submission to RCO and a high-quality Chapter 6 of the amended 2024 Comprehensive Plan.	No change.
“	“	“	Suggest clarifying the roles between Parks and Public Works regarding the Sound to Olympics Trail and when public involvement will occur, before approval of the PROS Plan.	No change. The Sound to Olympics Trail is currently in Public Works’ Transportation Improvement Plan for planning purposes but the project is unfunded. Public Works has retained leadership on this project to date.
4	Bethany Talley	Email	Please leave heritage parks as places for quiet recreation and as places for habitat and wildlife. Land around us is being developed into housing and commercial space, crowding out places for animals and plants.	No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks – the PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1). The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.
5	Katherine Lewis	Email	Please do not change the uses of heritage parks to other than natural use. The majority of residents support the current use of parks.	No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks – the PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1). The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.
6	Janice Gutman	Email	Preserve habitats with pedestrian-only trails throughout Heritage Parks. Support and enhance the volunteer Park Stewardship program. Maintain Port Gamble Heritage Forest’s status as a Heritage Park, don’t convert to a regional park. Do a better job of involving the community in decision-making and involve Park Stewards in planning.	No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement. The PROS Plan includes a number of goals and objectives that speak to fostering a volunteer program and providing volunteer opportunities on a variety of topics. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger

			Enhance public participation through more informational meetings, Q&A sessions, and extended comment periods.	<p>planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>
7	Charlene	Email	<p>Preserve habitats with pedestrian-only trails throughout Heritage Parks.</p> <p>Support and enhance the volunteer Park Stewardship program.</p> <p>Maintain Port Gamble Heritage Forest's status as a Heritage Park, don't convert to a regional park.</p> <p>Do a better job of involving the community in decision-making, and involve Park Stewards in planning.</p> <p>Enhance public participation through more informational meetings, Q&A sessions, and extended comment periods.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>The PROS Plan includes a number of goals and objectives that speak to fostering a volunteer program and providing volunteer opportunities on a variety of topics.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>
8	Amanda Dwyer	Email	<p>Put more emphasis on maintaining habitat and wild spaces in Heritage Parks.</p> <p>Keep Port Gamble a Heritage Park and not a Regional Park. Not in support of adding asphalt or other permanent surfaces. Important to keep it forested and allow clear cuts to regrow and not be converted to other purposes.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community</p>
9	Susan Whittington	Email	<p>Not in support of sports buildings, swimming, tennis, and ballfields in heritage parks – these parks need to be preserved for trees, wildlife, and hiking.</p> <p>Areas in Port Gamble are finally growing back from logging – don't put houses or rec facilities in that area.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks. The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>

10	Jamie Grivich Pelletier	Email	Please keep Kitsap parks natural. People, flora, and fauna need a break from civilization.	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks – the PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>
11	Lauren Silver	Email	Heritage parks are important for preserving habitat for diverse flora and fauna and wildlife corridors. Stand up in support of preserving Kitsap natural habitats while we still have some to protect and preserve.	No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).
12	Jonas Mueller-Gastell	Email	<p>Strongly opposed to proposed changes in management policies for heritage parks. County deeply values preserving natural habitats and proposed shift towards active recreation undermines this.</p> <p>Maintain pedestrian only trails. Additional active recreation trails are not needed - we have ample mountain bike trails and evidence suggests active recreation is harmful for wildlife and plant life.</p> <p>Let local engagement and volunteer groups take more center stage in parks management. Actively support and enhance stewardship groups, providing volunteers with resources and meaningful roles in park management and decision making. Engage with stewards early on planning processes and increase public participation.</p> <p>Keep Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park a Heritage Park – converting it into a regional park would damage its ecological integrity and character.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose changes in management policies for heritage parks.</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of “Heritage Park,” the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>

13	Athena Wahlstrom	Email	Fields and active uses are valuable – but our heritage parks should not be utilized for this. Preservation of these parks has made a desirable location for commercial and residential buyers and is a vital part of our biodiversity, which is critically important to preserve.	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose fields in heritage parks.</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>
14	Kathrin Dodds	Email	<p>Preserve habitats with pedestrian-only trails throughout Heritage Parks.</p> <p>Support and enhance the volunteer Park Stewardship program.</p> <p>Maintain Port Gamble Heritage Forest’s status as a Heritage Park, don’t convert to a regional park.</p> <p>Do a better job of involving the community in decision-making, and involve Park Stewards in planning.</p> <p>Enhance public participation through more informational meetings, Q&A sessions, and extended comment periods.</p> <p>Do not allow active recreation to replace nature!</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>The PROS Plan includes a number of goals and objectives that speak to fostering a volunteer program and providing volunteer opportunities on a variety of topics.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of “Heritage Park,” the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>
15	Teri McDaniel	Email	Leave heritage parks exactly as they are. Please find other areas that are no longer pristine and wild to add recreation and other types of interventions. Save the natural parks for the thousands that use them regularly.	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks – the PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>

16	Carol Kaufman	Email	<p>Concerned over proposed changes to emphasize active recreation and sports at heritage parks. Please preserve these habitats with pedestrian-only trails. Do not convert Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park to a regional park.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose active recreation and sports at heritage parks. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>
17	Halette Salazar	Email	<p>Youth sports are vital and should be accommodated, but not at the expense of every Kitsap citizen.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose elevating youth sports above other community needs.</p>
18	Anjali Banerjee	Email	<p>Preserve habitats with pedestrian-only trails throughout Heritage Parks.</p> <p>Support and enhance the volunteer Park Stewardship program.</p> <p>Maintain Port Gamble Heritage Forest's status as a Heritage Park. Don't convert it to a regional park.</p> <p>Involve the community in decision-making, and involve Park Stewards in planning.</p> <p>Enhance public participation through more informational meetings, Q&A sessions, and extended comment periods.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>The PROS Plan includes a number of goals and objectives that speak to fostering a volunteer program and providing volunteer opportunities on a variety of topics.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>
19	Eva Kenworthy	Email	<p>CIP and goals should reflect natural recreation as a priority (pedestrian-only trails, wildlife habitat, critical areas). Sports</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan CIP and goals reflect the need for both recreation facilities and natural area preservation.</p>

			facilities are important but should not come as an expense to natural areas.	The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.
20	Ben Strobel	Email	Protect the beauty, quiet, flora, and fauna of Kitsap's heritage parks.	No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).
21	Jason Hulsey	Email	Preserve the habitat, don't transfer the funds.	No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).
22	Reed Blanchard	Email	There are lots of bikes in Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park, they move fast and they are changing the way the woods function. Many of us want to keep spaces that are dedicated to wildlife, they are disappearing, and once they are damaged, it is very hard to bring them back. Bikes and other users are valuable but should not be the only consideration. When you add the pressure of proposed projects, such as the STO and general development, it starts to paint a dire picture for wildlife.	No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).
23	Claudia Gorbman	Email	<p>PROS Plan's goal of balance between critical area habitat conservation and human recreation is a recipe for degradation of wildlife habitat and remaining natural areas. The final plan needs to acknowledge and address the precarious state of the environment and prioritize habitat protection.</p> <p>Reconsider the emphasis on developing trails for mobility access in the heritage parks – paved trails cause damage to ecosystems and habitat. Preserve habitat with pedestrian only trails in heritage parks.</p> <p>Maintain Port Gamble as a heritage park, do not convert to a regional park.</p> <p>PROS plan conflates heritage parks with other Kitsap parks – heritage parks are essentially reserves and must remain that way.</p> <p>The Kitsap Environmental Coalition distinguishes between this idea of "recreation" and what is called "natural recreation": <i>"The residents of Kitsap County place a high value on natural recreation, such as hiking on trails, bird watching, and</i></p>	<p>The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1) and incorporation of environmental assessments as the beginning step in park planning (see Objective 3.2).</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not include paving of trails in heritage parks and does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement. The PROS Plan does, though, call out the need to improve ADA and other access into park, recreation facilities, and open spaces to better serve all of our community.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p>

			<i>respectfully enjoying the habitat of wildlife. This should be reflected as a high priority in the Park's Capital Improvement Plan and goals. This will provide funding for pedestrian-only trails, critical area and habitat protection (elevated boardwalks, bridges, and wildlife-viewing stations), needed to support natural recreation and harmony with other forms of life."</i>	
24	Lorna Griffin	Email	Paving of trails in heritage parks will disrupt fragile ecosystems in these parks and take away the feel of nature. I understand having trails available for people with disabilities, but there is lots of elevation on these trails, not wheelchair friendly. Lots of development occurring and destroying natural spaces, need to retain natural spaces and not turn heritage parks into regional parks.	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not include paving of trails in heritage parks. The Sound to Olympic (STO) trail is managed by the County's Public Works Department and is not included in the PROS Plan.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p>
25	Dori Craze	Email	Keep heritage parks natural.	No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).
26	Susan McDonough-Wachtman	Email	Preserve habitats – everywhere we look we see habitat destruction.	No change. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).
27	Kelly Roberts	Email	Keep heritage parks as is in order to preserve diverse habitats, County residents expressed preference to conserve these areas. Allowing active recreation and sports will damage species, benefits heritage parks provide will not be sustained if community members are having to compete with other types of uses proposed.	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>

27	David Smith	Email	<p>Concerned over changes to heritage parks, important to preserve current natural habitats within these parks.</p> <p>Preserve habitats by maintaining pedestrian-only trails throughout Heritage Parks.</p> <p>Support and strengthen the Volunteer Park Stewardship Program.</p> <p>Ensure that Port Gamble Heritage Forest maintains its status as a Heritage Park and is not converted into a regional park.</p> <p>Improve community involvement in decision-making processes by actively including Park Stewards in planning discussions.</p> <p>Increase public engagement through additional informational meetings, Q&A sessions, and extended opportunities for public comment.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>The PROS Plan includes a number of goals and objectives that speak to fostering a volunteer program and providing volunteer opportunities on a variety of topics.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of “Heritage Park,” the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>
28	Joan Fraik	Email	<p>Ask that the 2025 PROS Plan build on the 2018 PROS Plan – rather than use a new document, lengthy, confusing, and does not build on a produce that addressed the county’s parks and open space needs. It is important to protect habitat and wildlife, pedestrian-only trails. Residents and visitors need passive recreation and places to enjoy natural environments.</p>	<p>No change. The 2025 PROS Plan carries forward many of the themes in the 2018 PROS Plan – it also includes an updated inventory analysis, demand and need analysis, public engagement, and capital program, as required by Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The 2025 PROS Plan reorganizes the goals to better align with Department operations and to ensure that they are representative of all program areas of the Department.</p> <p>The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p>
29	Randy Mercado	Email Attachment	<p>Support stewardship groups – formally recognize and integrate stewardship groups into the management of heritage parks.</p> <p>Community involvement – residents must be central to planning</p>	<p>No change. The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of “Heritage Park,” the</p>

			<p>and decision-making processes.</p> <p>Preservation of heritage parks – Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park must retain its designation as a heritage park, not regional park.</p> <p>Prioritize natural recreation – must not prioritize active recreation or organized sports at the expense of natural recreation, quiet enjoyment, and preservation of wildlife corridors and natural habitats.</p>	<p>regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>
30	Julia Miller	Email	<p>Do not change heritage parks – many people value for them for the peace and quiet of walking the trails. Let volunteers continue their valuable stewardship of these parks. Adequate paved surfaces exist for those who want to engage in sports and other high energy activities.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not propose athletic facilities in heritage parks. The PROS Plan does emphasize protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1).</p> <p>The proposed North Kitsap United project that includes a YMCA, ballfields, and housing is on private property next to the park and not in the park.</p>
31	Katie Tertocha	Email	<p>Preserve habitats with pedestrian-only trails throughout Heritage Parks.</p> <p>Support and enhance the volunteer Park Stewardship program.</p> <p>Maintain Port Gamble Heritage Forest's status as a Heritage Park, don't convert to a regional park.</p> <p>Do a better job of involving the community in decision-making, and involve Park Stewards in planning.</p> <p>Enhance public participation through more informational meetings, Q&A sessions, and extended comment periods.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p> <p>The PROS Plan includes a number of goals and objectives that speak to fostering a volunteer program and providing volunteer opportunities on a variety of topics.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>
32	Randena Walsh	Email	<p>Rural nature and habitats are shrinking, North Kitsap has two</p>	<p>No change.</p>

			<p>heritage parks which were created to protect and preserve wildlife habitat and provide walking trails of natural materials.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park should continue to support wildlife habitat and provide passive recreation of walking trails of natural surfaces. It should not be converted to a regional park.</p> <p>Stewards' voices should be integral in heritage park planning. North Kitsap Heritage Parks should be managed with a dedicated stewardship committee, it deserves protections consistent with the NK Heritage Park Stewardship Plan.</p>	<p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts.</p>
33	Linda Larson	Email	<p>Please preserve pedestrian only trails in the heritage parks. Port Gamble has its own ride park and forestry roads. It's time to think about those that go to the forest for peace and quiet and not have to be worried about a collision with a bicycle.</p>	<p>No change. The PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement.</p>
34	Thomas Doty	Email Attachment	<p>Attachment lists accomplishments from the North Kitsap Heritage Park Stewardship Group from 2013-2023.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
35	Stephen Weagant	Email Attachment	<p>Preparation of 2025 PROS Plan – repetitive, departure from style and substance of 2018 PROS Plan. The draft is months overdue without any chance for review and input from concerned groups such as the PAB or KEC. There should have been additional time to review and provide comments.</p> <p>Park reclassifications - Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park is designated as a regional park. Propose splitting the park and designating the ride park and north end as active recreation/regional park and the remaining area as a natural area park. Many trails would be hiking only and where bicycling is allowed, Parks should enforce 10mph speed limit.</p> <p>Stewardship roles – stewardship groups have worked well to maintain and enhance heritage parks at little expense or staff time to the Department. 2025 PROS Plan formalizes a new system where park stewards become park volunteers supervised by M&O and relegates volunteer stewardship to a very limited role. Many stewards have left for more rewarding roles.</p> <p>Park speed limits – many trails in parks are multi-user, several respondents voiced safety concerns about excessive bike speeds on trails. PROS Plan should address ways to control excessive</p>	<p>No change. Comment previously addressed. The 2025 PROS Plan carries forward many of the themes in the 2018 PROS Plan – it also includes an updated inventory analysis, demand and need analysis, public engagement, and capital program, as required by Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). The 2025 PROS Plan reorganizes the goals to better align with Department operations and to ensure that they are representative of all program areas of the Department. There were multiple opportunities for public engagement throughout the plan development process and the Department shared project updates and collected feedback from the Parks Advisory Board (PAB) throughout the process. The PAB and members of KEC were also interviewed by the consultant during the stakeholder interviews.</p> <p>Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park will retain the name and title of "Heritage Park," the regional park classification does not change this. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park already has development that is consistent with the regional park classification. As described in the PROS Plan, on their own, the park classification does not dictate park management or what activities and facilities within a park are allowed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for Parks Department programs, such as the volunteer program.</p> <p>The Parks Department does not have an enforcement program, but parks rules signs</p>

			<p>bicycle speeds in county parks, particularly Port Gamble.</p> <p>Carrying capacity – some thought should be given to carrying capacity in nature parks, too many visitors and pets using the park can damage trails, disturb animals, degrade natural environment and degrade user experience. Parking and trailheads should be sized appropriately. Consideration is also needed for the impact of parking lots on neighbors and traffic flow (where applicable). The process for evaluating heritage parks for natural features and critical areas was detailed in the 2018 PROS Plan and is largely eliminated in the 2025 Plan.</p>	<p>are posted and park entrances and trailheads.</p> <p>Parking lot projects will be sized and located appropriately based on a park’s intended usage and park management plan, which will be developed with community input.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

DRAFT

DRAFT