



Kitsap County Department of Community Development

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

Comments Received Through May 27, 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. | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| “ | “ | “ | 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. | <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>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.</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| “ | “ | “ | 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> |
| 36 | Beverly Parsons | Email | <p>Following up on previous comments.</p> <p>The PROS Plan lacks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) Priority setting within the plan (2) Methods of engagement of multiple user groups and interested parties in modifying and carrying out projects over the six years covered by the plan <p>Current priorities need to be clearly specified and the processes to adjust and carry out the priorities over time need to be explained in the final version of the PROS Plan.</p> <p>Ongoing engagement of park users and interested parties is crucial as priorities are modified and carried out in the six years covered by the PROS Plan. In complex and changing situations, priorities need to be regularly reviewed and plans for carrying them out need to be adjusted. The methods of engagement also change.</p> | <p>No change. The PROS Plan is intended to provide guidance on policy development and department decision making through the framework of the Goals and Objectives but does not specify a priority ranking of the Goals and Objectives. The Plan does provide a high-level prioritization of the Capital Improvement Projects for the categories “1-6 years” and “6+ years.” The Department is currently developing evaluation criteria to refine the CIP project prioritization process further.</p> <p>The Parks Department does and will continue to engage with the public and different user groups on park projects as applicable and when projects are underway.</p> |
| 37 | Anna | Email | <p>Do not recommend “multi-use” trails, they are too dangerous and disrupt everyone’s enjoyment. They sound good, but in practice, there are safety concerns yielding is not obeyed, speeding cyclists. Parks Department lacks staff for enforcement. Please provide separate trails for different users, especially in confined areas – multi-use is only appropriate for a few wide arterial trails.</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. Goal 3, Objective 3.1, Action 3.1.4 identifies the need to reduce recreational conflicts during park planning to ensure compatible uses and enhance user experience. This goal is intended to assist, among other things, user conflicts on trails by evaluating management needs during the park planning process.</p> |
| 38 | April Ryan | Email | <p>North Kitsap Heritage Park stewards are very knowledge about a variety of tasks and there has been a strong sense of community</p> | <p>No change. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for Parks Department programs, such as the volunteer program.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------------|-------|--|---|
| | | | responsibility for the park. Recently have noticed a shift away from supported stewardship – why is Parks administration discouraging valuable stewardship? Stewardship is different than causal volunteer and should not be treated as manual labor under the M&O division. | |
| 39 | April Ryan | Email | <p>Heritage parks are primarily intended for conservation, not sports or active recreation. PGFHP was funded by community members who were led to believe the purchase was to preserve the land – it is now being developed aggressively, justified by a classification to “Regional Park.”</p> <p>Ride Park has been built out for the exclusive use of cyclists. Please keep this active recreation area contained and do not allow cyclists to take over the entire park. Divide PGFHP into a northern section for cyclists and the southern section for hikers, equestrians, and wildlife habitat. Connect the two with a north-south trail wide enough for multi-use (not paved).</p> <p>Taxpayer money is supporting the maintenance of PGFHP – funding and effort should support other uses besides ride park (such as natural trails, lookouts, interpretive signage, scotchbroom control).</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). 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> <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 or will be developed, this is a more involved process and will be done as a larger planning effort with input from the community.</p> <p>Staff time and resources supports additional activities at Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park, such as trail maintenance, vegetation removal, volunteer coordination, as well as contracting with groups to carry out certain maintenance activities.</p> |
| 40 | Nancy D’Archangel | Email | <p>1. Many locals enjoy Heritage Parks weekly if not daily. They should have more opportunities for input as to how decisions are made regarding the parks.</p> <p>2. I have worked with environmental groups for 25 years to preserve habitat and provide wildlife corridors. The Heritage Parks are critical links in these wildlife corridors and need to be preserved in their natural state.</p> <p>3. Prohibiting motorized vehicles is important not only for keeping the parks welcoming to wildlife but also to the safety and enjoyment of the people that use them. Even a short daily walk in Heritage Park, unplugging from all our electronics is important for our mental health.</p> <p>4. The North End community participated in fundraising to purchase Port Gamble Heritage Park. They should definitely be participants in how the park is administered. The idea of turning it into a regional park seems very wrong especially if the</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>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 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. Goal 3, Objective 3.1, Action 3.1.4 identifies the need to reduce recreational conflicts during park planning to ensure compatible uses and enhance user experience. This goal is intended to assist,</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|-------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | | decision isn't made by the community. | among other things, user conflicts on trails by evaluating management needs during the park planning process. The Parks Department does and will continue to provide opportunities for community engagement, including as part of park planning and development efforts. |
| 41 | Carol Price | Email | <p>Parks Department is proposing significant changes to the way it manages parks – emphasizing active recreation and sports at the expense of natural recreation.</p> <p>Prioritize the preservation of natural spaces and habitats utilizing regeneration and restoration practices in all parks.</p> <p>Provide pedestrian-only trails throughout the KC Parks system.</p> <p>Support and enhance the volunteer Park Stewardship program, including stewardship groups for each park.</p> <p>Maintain Port Gamble Heritage Forest's status as a Heritage Park; do not convert it to a regional park.</p> <p>Do a better job of involving the community in decision-making; involve Park Stewards and Stewardship groups in planning.</p> <p>Enhance public participation through rigorous community outreach, Q&A sessions, and extended public comment periods. KC Parks needs to engage in a real conversation with Kitsap residents</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> <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. Goal 3, Objective 3.1, Action 3.1.4 identifies the need to reduce recreational conflicts during park planning to ensure compatible uses and enhance user experience. This goal is intended to assist, among other things, user conflicts on trails by evaluating management needs during the park planning process.</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> |
| 42 | Carol Price | Email Attachment | <p>Support utilization of environmentally friendly trail construction materials.</p> <p>Planning process needs to be formalized and included in the 2025 PROS Plan.</p> <p>PROS Plan should not encourage transportation routes passing</p> | <p>No change. Comment previously addressed.</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 PROS Plan does not designate certain trails for certain user group(s). This level</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>through the parks, especially heritage parks.</p> <p>Based on the definition in Appendix B, the STO is a bikeway and not a trail. Bikeways emphasize direct routes, speed, and connectivity to roadway networks. The STO is not a direct route. State directly if pg. 19 is a reference to the STO.</p> <p>County residents need to be active participants in trail planning and decision making.</p> <p>Eglon Forest will need assessments and wetland delineations before any trail building occurs.</p> <p>Parks Bucks survey – survey would have been more revealing if separate options for biking and walking had been offered. Other studies show biking down on the list of activities, but Parks Department insists trails be built and maintained for multiple users (trails preferred by bikers are different than those preferred by hikers).</p> <p>Scale back multi-user trails and designate separate trails for user groups. PROS Plan addresses user conflicts as a safety issue, the inherent danger of mountain biking is ignored – as far as we know there are no official records kept on emergency medical events in parks. Parks should be transparent regarding accidents; safety records need to be maintained and PAB notified.</p> <p>No reference to motorized mobility devices in the PROS Plan, they already pose serious safety issues for all ark users. They have no place on park trails.</p> <p>I urge our local officials to shift their focus in the PROS Plan from the <i>usage</i> of parks to an emphasis on <i>responsibility</i> for parklands and wildlife; shift the emphasis from <i>park users</i> to humans as <i>park visitors</i>. At the same time, conservation, restoration and protection for parklands needs to be prioritized over the PROS Plan’s single-minded focus on access for all humans to recreate. This approach can encourage stewardship, improve the quality of our parks, and increase support and advocacy for wildlife and native plants. Let’s grow a deeper appreciation and responsibility for the true wealth of the natural world found in Kitsap’s 11,600 acres of parks. This is a necessity <i>not</i> an ideal.</p> | <p>of detail would be evaluated during a park-specific planning effort, which would include opportunities for public engagement. Goal 3, Objective 3.1, Action 3.1.4 identifies the need to reduce recreational conflicts during park planning to ensure compatible uses and enhance user experience. This goal is intended to assist, among other things, user conflicts on trails by evaluating management needs during the park planning process.</p> <p>E-bikes will be addressed when the Department updates the Park Code (KCC 10.12).</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for the Parks Department, such as a park planning process. However, the PROS Plan does provide 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>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> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-------|--|--|
| 43 | April Ryan | Email | <p>Support strengthening the stewardship program. Beyond increasing community engagement in parks, stewardship groups have provided invaluable fiscal benefit. It is time for new parks leadership to recognize and value the contributions that stewards have made and will continue to make if fully supported.</p> <p><i>List of specific accomplishments provided.</i></p> | <p>No change. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for Parks Department programs, such as the volunteer program.</p> |
| 44 | Niki Quester | Email | <p>Primary purpose of heritage parks is aquifer recharge, carbon sequestration, habitat for plants and animals, and passive creation for humans. Sports fields, bikes, etc. belong somewhere else as they interfere with the primary functions.</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> |
| 42 | Robin Salthouse | Email | <p>Current PROS Plan does not build on the goals and strategies for heritage parks from the 2018 PROS Plan – instead it turns Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park into a regional park, which gets rid of many of the protections, conservation and rural attributes many Kitsap County residents value. Planning Commission should maintain Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park as a heritage park and prioritize trails within PG as pedestrian only. Funding was secured to purchase the land for conservation and not make the park into a high impact, active recreation center. Much of the northwest portion of the park is becoming highly developed with the mountain bike ride park. There is one pedestrian only trail in the forest.</p> <p>Future PROS Plan should have specific goals strategies, and capital improvement plans that conserve and protect forest habitat and wildlife in our nature based heritage parks. They should closely align and support the 2024 Comprehensive Plan, specifically Chapter 5.</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 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. Goal 3, Objective 3.1, Action 3.1.4 identifies the need to reduce recreational conflicts during park planning to ensure compatible uses and enhance user experience. This goal is intended to assist, among other things, user conflicts on trails by evaluating management needs during the park planning process.</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 or will be developed, 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 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.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 43 | April Ryan | Email | <p>Appreciate the opportunities for community engagement in development of the PROS Plan, but the public input is not reflected in the actual Plan. The majority of park users preferred natural trails, this should be identified as a priority. Instead it is minimized and not listed as a priority in the CIP. Seems there was a disconnect between the public and the consultant who authored the Plan.</p> <p>If the plan had been released as a 30% draft, this divergence could have been identified and sent back for editing. The public received a final draft for review with little opportunity to make meaningful change.</p> <p>This Plan is not an update of the 2018 Plan – the Parks Department decided to take a different approach and develop a plan that reflected their needs. Plan is long and vaguely written, could be implemented in ways that counter what the public wants.</p> <p>Please respect the draft-review-edit process.</p> | <p>No change. Natural trails do not always rise up to the level of a capital project, which is why they are not included in the capital project list. Nonetheless, Parks does recognize that walking, hiking, and access to trails is highly important to Kitsap County. The five-week long public comment period provided an opportunity for members of the public to provide comments; Parks staff made changes to the Draft Plan as a result.</p> <p>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> |
| 44 | David Onstad | Written Comment | <p>Major concerns over the PROS Plan and lack of protections for heritage parks – Parks Department needs to find ways to improve the planning process for heritage parks.</p> <p>PROS Plan does not meet definition of a plan. It consists of many bits of information about public comments and basic facts, but is too vague, superficial, and unrealistic to be a plan.</p> <p>Major projects, such as the NSTO are no longer being considered in Parks Department planning, though they will likely be bulldozed right through two heritage parks. County seems to believe (or at least wants the public to believe) that it can select capital projects without accounting for the NSTO.</p> <p>County notes details will be in management plans for each park – for example, management framework for PGFHP was declared a fantastic achievement in Dec 2022 and has been guiding the Department since, including convincing Kitsap Public Facilities District to provide a huge amount of money for the facilities in PGFHP. The Framework has never been legally approved by the Commissioners. County wants it both ways – no details now in the PROS Plan and no approval of details in park specific plans.</p> | <p>No change.</p> <p>The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for the Parks Department, such as the planning process. However, the PROS Plan does provide 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>Paved, multi-use trails live within the Public Works in the Nonmotorized Facilities Plan. The Parks Department will help collaborate on planning efforts if these trails are proposed to traverse through County parks.</p> <p>The Interlocal Agreement with Kitsap Public Facilities District was approved in January 2020, before the PGFHP Framework was completed. The scope of the agreement included the development of the park Framework as well as park development projects. The Framework is intended to be updated in 2026 and will then go before the Commissioners for consideration.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|------------------|---|---|
| | | | Require more careful planning by the Parks Department. | |
| 45 | Anne Stevens | Email Attachment | <p>Advocate for the plan to optimize equitable nature and green space access for children in places where they live, play, and learn. Know first hand how immersion in nature transforms the lives of young people. Also published data shows that exposure to nature and green spaces is critical to the physical and mental development of a healthy child.</p> <p>In this era of epidemic childhood stress and anxiety, protecting as much as land as possible to maintain green space and wildlands is critical. Paving over wildlands for any reason (including recreation) would directly contradict this goal.</p> | No change. The PROS Plan does include goals, objectives, and actions that speak to improving equitable access to parks and green spaces for all, as well as emphasizing protection of biodiversity and ecological integrity in all park lands managed for conservation and preservation, including heritage parks (see Objective 2.1). |
| 46 | Lynn Schorn | Email | Thank you to Kitsap County Parks Department for all the work and community outreach that has gone into developing the PROS Plan. Plan needs to move forward or no guidelines, grants, calendar can be attained. This is a needed plan and does not define a heritage park, a regional park, define its users, types of trails, or go into specifics. | No change. |
| 47 | Beth Nichols | Email | <p>Kitsap residents strongly value Kitsap's natural environment and want parks to protect valuable environmental resources where they still remain. Heritage parks give us an opportunity to protect areas that are unique with vibrant ecosystems.</p> <p>Heritage park provide areas for habitat. Want the County to support natural recreation (such as walking trails) to allow natural habitat and ecosystems to thrive.</p> <p>Updated PROS Plan appears to have more of an emphasis on active recreation that is not in balance with preserving habitat. There needs to be process of assessment of natural resources and landscape classifications to determine what sensitive resources are in the park landscapes before planning and development.</p> <p>The current PROS Plan appears to take a turn away from public input, away from habitat protection and natural recreation, and proceeds blindly with poor planning.</p> <p>Do not change the name of heritage parks, give stewards respect</p> | <p>No change.</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>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 the Parks Department, such as an environmental assessment and landscape classifications process. However, the PROS Plan does provide 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>and support, and have true public involvement instead of lip service.</p> <p>More work needs done on the PROS Plan to bring it into better balance of environmental protection and more honoring of public input.</p> | |
| 48 | Martha Burke | Email Attachment | <p>More than 75% of park and open space acreage is in the six heritage parks, these lands remain primarily undeveloped natural areas with environmentally sensitive areas preserved or enhanced. Their physical characteristics lend themselves to varied passive and conservation uses. 89% of respondents said that nature activities were their primary reason for visiting parks.</p> <p>Port Gamble is especially important – it provides critical habitat for plants and wildlife and is large enough to have areas that can be protected with minimal human disturbance. Urge the Planning Commission to maintain the category of heritage park, especially for Port Gamble.</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> |
| 49 | Anne Stevens | Email Attachment | <p>Parks Department said they have a shortage of staff to maintain parks, especially regional parks that require maintenance of sports fields and other developed facilities. They also said there are grants to build facilities, but not for maintenance and that steward programs mainly maintains the heritage parks.</p> <p>It seems fiscally infeasible to change Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park into a regional park for the purpose of building out recreational facilities that would increase maintenance requirements that cannot be fulfilled with current budgets.</p> | <p>No change. 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 or will be developed, 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, including Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park.</p> |
| 50 | Steve Weagant | Email Attachment | <p>North Kitsap Heritage Park stewards undertook many projects between 2013-2018, including developing a Forest Stewardship Plan and NKHP Master Plan.</p> <p>Urge the Planning Commission to ask that the formal process of environmental assessment and land classifications within heritage parks (as included in 2018 PROS Plan) be included in the 2025 PROS Plan.</p> | <p>No change. The PROS Plan does not include specific operations for the Parks Department, such as an environmental assessment and landscape classifications process. However, the PROS Plan does provide 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>NKHP Master Plan is outside of the scope of the PROS Plan process.</p> |

| | | | | |
|----|---------------|-------|---|--|
| | | | Urge the BOCC to formally adopt the NKHP Master Plan. | |
| 51 | Joe Lubischer | Email | <p>Request for supplemental information be added to the PROS Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Financial Planning & Parks Staffing – Department understaffed by 19 employees, expected to lose 2-5 FTEs. Semi-autonomous and low cost stewardship groups are marginalized and rejected. PROS Plan needs specifics for how the Department will address the staffing shortfall need to be included. 2. Planning protocol for Heritage Parks – Coulter Creek, Eglon, Port Gamble need planning, 2018 PROS Plan laid out specific planning process. 2025 guidance is extremely brief, general, and does not provide meaningful guidance. 3. Landscape Classifications – Landscape classifications have been applied to North Kitsap Heritage Park and Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park – the system needs to be included in the 2025 PROS Plan if for no other reason than it is actively used in master plans for at least two heritage parks. 4. Carrying Capacity – Analysis of each park’s carrying capacity is a standardized process. PROS Plan needs goals, strategies, and timelines for conducting these analyses. 5. Electric Mobility Devices – No enforcement for types or speeds is provided. State guidance has not proved adequate. PROS Plan is silent on e-bikes – Parks Department needs to develop a long term approach to electric mobility devices. PROS Plan needs to lay out the current situation and lay out a path forward for policy development. | <p>No change. Comment previously addressed. The PROS Plan is a high-level planning document for the department and is not an operations manual. It does not include specific operations or policies for the Parks Department, such as a staffing plan, planning protocol, or landscape classifications. Nonetheless, these are important and developing these policies and protocols are underway, but will take time to complete.</p> |

DRAFT