



KITSAP COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, August 20, 2025

TIME: 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM

LOCATION: This is a virtual only meeting. Due to the Kitsap Fair Event at the Fairgrounds, the Eagle's Nest Community Center is not available for in-person attendance.

Zoom link will be posted on the [home page](#) of Kitsap County Parks website on the day of the meeting. The link is the bottom right-hand side under the heading: **Upcoming Parks Advisory Board Meeting**.

Pre-Meeting: Virtual meeting format, information, and instructions

- I. Welcome & Introductions**
- II. Adoption of the July 16, 2025 meeting minutes**
- III. Public Comment (3-minute limit/person)**

Public comments are welcome at this time. If you have questions or are seeking information from the Parks Department, please contact us at parks@kitsap.gov so that your inquiry may be directed to the appropriate Parks Department staff for a response.
- IV. Special Presentations/Reports**
 - a. Draft CIP 2026-2031 *Carmen Smith*
 - b. Forest Stewardship & Restoration Policy and Implementation Plan Public Engagement *Irene Weber*
- V. Parks Report**
 - a. Director's Report *Alex Wisniewski, Alex Hardy, Irene Weber, Carmen Smith*
- VI. Sub-Committee Meetings (since last PAB meeting)**
 - a. Visitor Services
 - i. Event Policies and Fees
- VII. District Representative Reports**
- VIII. Public Comment (3-minute limit/person)**
- IX. Adjournment**



KITSAP COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

2025 Sub Committee Assignments

Sub Committee	Type	Focus Area	PAB Members	Parks Staff <i>(may vary by topic)</i>
Finance & Budget	Standing (per by laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operating Budget Funding Opportunities 	Linda Nancy Larry	Parks Director
Capital Projects & Parks	Standing (per by laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital Projects Program M&O Program 	Lisa Dawn Jon Amy	Parks Planner M&O Supervisor
Community Outreach & Visitor Services	Ad Hoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Events and Rentals Program Marketing Volunteer Program Youth Engagement 	Nancy Jessica	Marketing & Events Supervisor Natural Resources Supervisor
Planning & Property	Ad Hoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Program Natural Resources Program Land Acquisition & Divestiture Park Code 	Lisa Dawn Linda Jon	Parks Planner Natural Resources Supervisor

2025 Agenda Items and Sub-Committee Meetings

Month	Task or Agenda Item	Board or Sub-Committee Assignment
January	Board Chair and Vice Chair Elections	Board (completed in October 2024)
	PAB Annual Workplan	Board
	Sub-Committee Assignments	Board
	Events Year in Review	Board
February	PROS Plan	Board
	PAB Annual Workplan	Board
	Sub-Committee Assignments	Board
March	PROS Plan	Board
	Sub-Committee Assignments	Board
April	PROS Plan	Board
May	CIP Priority Methodology Development	Capital Projects & Parks
	Maintenance & Operations Study	Board
June	CIP Priority Methodology Development	Capital Projects & Parks
	Forest Restoration & Stewardship Policy	Planning & Property
	Draft CIP Development	Capital Projects & Parks
July	2026 Budget Development	Finance & Budget
	Forest Restoration & Stewardship Policy	Board
	Events Policy and Fee Schedule	Community Outreach & Visitor Services
August	Draft CIP Development	Board
	2026 Budget Development	Board
	Events Policy and Fee Schedule	Community Outreach & Visitor Services
September	Nominating Sub-Committee (appointed by Chair)	Chair
	Events Policy and Fee Schedule	Board
October		



**KITSAP COUNTY
PARKS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

November		
December		

KITSAP COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY BOARD

DRAFT July 16, 2025

MEETING MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 PM by the Parks Advisory Board Chair, Larry Walker. Guidelines of the hybrid Parks Advisory Board Meeting were read.

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

- Review of June meeting minutes.

ACTION | Jessica Rice motioned to adopt June 18, 2025
Dawn Dockter seconded the motion.

Discussion | None

VOTE | All in favor.
No opposition.
Minutes approved.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD –

- Loren “Bill” Wasson – President of the Friends of the Newberry Hill Heritage Park a non-profit group. Referenced an email that he received from Parks staff regarding volunteer work projects and safety concerns.
- Frank Strickland – Shared historical information and work party practices of the Friends of Newberry Hill Heritage Park. This group is a 501 c Charity for Newberry Hill Heritage Park (NHHP). This group has requested a Memorandum of Understanding with the Parks Department.
- Michelle Ring – Volunteer with Newberry Hill Heritage Friends. Provided comments regarding the email sent to the group from the Parks Department. She spoke about the Gary Oak project and invited county members to visit the parks.

SPECIAL PRESENTATIONS/REPORTS

- Forest Stewardship and Restoration Policy and Implementation Plan – Irene Weber, Natural Resources Supervisor and Kevin Ceder, Stewardship Forester.
Staff provided an overview of the Natural Resources Program and Stewardship Forester history, program purpose, park/forest history, current conditions and future goals for forests in Kitsap County parks. Provided an overview of the Forest Restoration Planning Structure. Staff also provided a detailed review of the purpose and intent of the Forest Restoration program. The policy update will utilize modern science and best practices. The primary objective is to restore and develop resilient forests and is not a revenue generator. Shared financial sustainability predictions and emphasized that all restoration activities are based on ecological needs. Provided an overview of the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park restoration achievements and a list of planned treatment areas and plans for outreach efforts.

Draft 2024 Forest Stewardship Policy (Updated June 2025), Draft Forest Stewardship and Restoration Implementation Plan, Port Gamble 2025 Stewardship and Restoration Project Plan and Report, and presentation slides are available on Parks Department website.

Discussion on Parks community-use impact, clarification of types of Plans, monitoring

processes, soil enhancement strategies, history of Port Gamble plans, REET II funding definitions and availability.

PARKS REPORT

DIRECTORS REPORT –

Capital Project Program Update -

- Acquisition of 16.8 acres of new undeveloped property to be incorporated into Illahee Preserve Heritage Park. This purchase was accomplished by Jim Aho and the Illahee Forest Preserve stewards and a RCO grant. This helps the Illahee Forest Preserve Heritage Park move towards the vision of the Stewardship Group to acquire parcels to protect the Illahee Creek watershed.
- Point No Point Beach and Shoreline Repair project. Final permit received from the US Coast Guard. Construction permitting and public bidding process happening simultaneously. Shoreline work must be performed during the “water work window” from July 15 through October 15.
Park remains closed to vehicle entry. Pedestrian access will be closed in certain areas at certain times during construction.
Fishing season will overlap with the construction and may cause challenges.

SUB-COMMITTEE REPORTS –

- Capital Projects and Parks – Capital Improvement Program (CIP) development for the 2026 through 2031, six-year CIP is in process. Using the project evaluation tool for preliminary scoring with staff and subcommittee review. Subcommittee will be meeting again to focus on balancing the CIP by location and project type.

Discussion about ADA and wheelchair accessibility in Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park (PGFHP). The Commissioner for District One has provided directions to wait on this and other projects until the PGFHP Framework is updated.

- Planning and Property – The subcommittee met to discuss the Forest Stewardship and Restoration Policy and Implementation Plan. Comments from PAB member regarding the efforts to balance the program expenses and the need for this work even if it is not a self-sustaining program. Concerns about maintaining staff positions with a funding source that is not secure.
- Community Outreach and Visitor Services – Subcommittee met to discuss updates to the Events Policy and Fee Schedule. Subcommittee members took a tour of the Fairgrounds and learned about the history of the events program. Discussed new and creative ways to provide rental space and services to the community. The updates are well thought-out, easy to work with, and a significant improvement.

Can a subcommittee be formed to discuss and focus on a resolution of the issues with volunteer groups?

PAB Chair plans to meet with key volunteers to discuss and begin to move toward resolve.

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS –

- North District | Thirteen years ago a private property owner gave a lease to the North Kitsap Trails Association for public access to the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park through their property. Due to the road work Rayonier is performing at this property, the

property owner has decided to temporarily close access to the park via their property until the timber harvest is complete. Request for Parks to post signs to notify park users of closure and support the property owner's decision. The statement from the property owner was read aloud.

- Central District | Chico Salmon Park is having issues with rock dams being built along the creek by park users. Stewards are increasing their visits to remove the structures and are utilizing See, Click, Fix to report. Lots of signage to educate the damage these dams cause.
- South District | none

PUBLIC COMMENT

- Frank Strickland – Curious about the current science on hardwoods in the riparian area. Newberry Hill Heritage Park is very short on hardwoods, and they are critical to the salmon fry that are in the riparian area in this park. Does the Forestry Plan address this topic?

Irene stated that it is something that would be addressed at the park level plan and at the project level. The Forest Restoration Policy and Implementation Plan is a higher-level planning document.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION | Dawn Dockter motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Amy Lawrence seconded the motion.

Discussion | None

VOTE | All in favor.

Motioned approved. The meeting was adjourned at 8:04 PM.

PARKS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING | ATTENDANCE

PAB MEMBERS	STAFF	PUBLIC (In Person)
Larry Walker – South	Alex Wisniewski - Director	Online public attendee names not captured
Linda Berry Maraist - North	Camern Smith – Parks Planner	
Dawn Dockter - South	Irene Weber – Natural Resource Supervisor	
Jessica Rice – South	Kevin Ceder – Stewardship Forester	Hank Anderson
Nancy Whitaker - Central		Frank Strickland
Amy Lawrence - Central		Joel Bolin
		Eric Martin
		Pat Strickland
		Diane Wasson
		Loren Wasson “Bill”
		David Onstad
		Michelle Ring.



Parks Department

1195 NW Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311
Mailing address: 614 Division, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366
Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385
www.kitsapgov.com/parks

Alex Wisniewski, Director

Director's Report

Date: 8/20/2025
To: Parks Advisory Board
From: Alex Wisniewski, Parks Director

Administration Program

2026 Budget Submission

The proposed 2026 budget for the Parks department was submitted on August 11, 2025. The budget submission highlights include:

- Budget cut of \$197,646.
- Increase in costs for utilities.
- Increase in projected revenue from the Events Program.
- Increased reliance on the Parks Facilities Maintenance (1501) special revenue fund for general department operational expenses (due to the rising costs of utility expenses in the General Fund).

The Parks department will present the proposed 2026 budget and budget cuts to the Parks Advisory Board's Finance and Budget sub-committee in late August/early September, the Parks Advisory Board on September 17, 2025, and the Board of County Commissioners on September 19, 2025.

Marketing & Events Program

Event Policy Update

Draft updates to the event policy and fee structure were discussed with the Community Outreach & Visitor Services sub-committee of the Parks Advisory Board (PAB) on July 10 and August 14, 2025. The County's Prosecuting Attorney's Office is reviewing the policy for legal compliance and a recent comment period by event stakeholders concluded. Information from these reviews and engagements was used to inform and update the policies and fee structure; these will be presented to the full PAB in September.

Project timeline:

- BoCC Workstudy
 - September 2024
- PAB Sub-committee Review
 - July – August 2025
- PAB Approval
 - September 2025
- BoCC Workstudy
 - September 2025

- BoCC Approval
 - October 2025
 - New Policy Roll Out
 - January 2026
- *Supports PROS Goal: 5, Objective 5.1, Action 5.1.2*

Events By the Numbers and Events Calendar

Data on the number of reservations at each of the Parks Facilities is attached; please see *Attachment A*.

- Outward-facing events calendar: [Kitsap County Parks Event Calendar \(kitsapgov.com\)](https://www.kitsapgov.com/events)
- Online reservations and payment portal: [Kitsap County Parks > Home \(recdesk.com\)](https://www.kitsapgov.com/online-reservations)

<u>August Public Events</u>		
<u>Event</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Location</u>
Kitsap Live Steamers - Public Run Day	September 1	South Kitsap Regional Park
Salish Recovery Coalition 5K Run	September 5	Illahee Preserve
West Sound Roller Derby	September 6	Pavilion @ Fairgrounds and Events Center
KOP CTA Sewing Room Sale	September 10	Presidents Hall @ Fairgrounds and Events Center
Hangtime Women's Jump Jam	September 12-13	Ride Park @ Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park
Bikes For All	September 12	Fairgrounds and Events Center
Big Top Gun Show	September 13-14	Presidents Hall @ Fairgrounds and Events Center
Kitsap Destruction Derby Association	September 13	Thunderbird Arena at Fairgrounds and Events Center
Kitsap Live Steamers - Public Run Day	September 13	South Kitsap Regional Park
Peninsula Dog Fanciers Club - Scent Work Dog Show	September 26-28	Presidents Hall @ Fairgrounds and Events Center
Kitsap Live Steamers - Public Run Day	September 27	South Kitsap Regional Park
King of the Jungle - Disc Golf	September 27-28	Kitsap Fairgrounds Disc Golf Park

BoCC-Sponsored Events

<u>Event</u>	<u>Status</u>	<u>2025 Attendance</u>
Martin Luther King Jr. Day	January 20, 2025	300
Military Appreciation Day	March 15, 2025	1,200
FARM Days	May 19-20, 2025	3,000
Veterans Day Ceremony	November 11, 2025	
Toys for Tots	December 13, 2025	

The Commissioner's Office and Parks are partnering on the implementation of 2024 Board-directed changes to the County's event support practices. Changes will be communicated to event organizers in early 2025 in close collaboration with Board members. Implementation of the changes will not take place until 2026.

Maintenance & Operations

Park and Facility Maintenance

Staff are fully engaged in the summer season, dedicating most of their time to daily custodial duties such as cleaning bathrooms, emptying trash cans, identifying hazards or



Parks Department

1195 NW Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311

Mailing address: 614 Division, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366

Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385

www.kitsapgov.com/parks

Alex Wisniewski, Director

needed repairs, and performing groundskeeping tasks like mowing, trimming, and blowing. Outdoor showers at Buck Lake Park and Horseshoe Lake Park have been repaired, along with several toilets at Long Lake Park and the Fairgrounds. Parking lots and curbs have been repaired at Island Lake Park and the Fairgrounds, and some now have fresh red paint identifying fire lanes.

Additionally, staff have replaced and repaired all exterior lights at the Fairgrounds, many of which have been converted to LED. Flower and shrub beds have been weeded and mulched, and landscaping activities around the Fairgrounds and Gordon Park have been increased in preparation for the upcoming County Fair event; the grounds and buildings were turned over to the Kitsap Fair & Stampede Association on August 1 for event prep. All identified repairs or maintenance were completed thanks to the diligence and collaboration of the Parks M&O and Events teams.

➤ *Supports PROS Goal 6.5*

Trail Maintenance

Staff completed trail corridor maintenance clearing at Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park, including the Spring Trail, Beaver Pond and Forbidden Forest trails. Coordinated efforts with trails volunteers are scheduled for both North Kitsap Heritage Park and Port Gamble Heritage Park in August for additional maintenance.

➤ *Supports PROS Goal 6.3, 6.4*

Ballfield Maintenance

The projects team has begun renovating the Bill Bloomquist Rotary Park softball fields in south Kitsap; the poor-quality infield mix material is being removed, and a new skinned infield will be installed, incorporating specialized calcined clay (Turface) products into the soil for better drainage and moisture-holding capacity. This project is expected to last 4-6 weeks, as staff are moving over 400 yards of material on and off-site.

Park staff have also been diligently maintaining athletic field irrigation systems by tuning them up, fixing leaks, and replacing malfunctioning valves to ensure responsible water management. In July, staff focused on South Kitsap Regional Park, adjusting the water usage for the large athletic turf fields. Maintenance efforts are also ongoing for the sports turf and irrigation systems at Veterans Memorial and Bill Bloomquist Rotary parks. Increased cultural maintenance practices and improvements to irrigated turf will yield benefits in the coming sports seasons.

➤ *Supports PROS Goal 6.5*

Unplanned Maintenance: Vandalism and HEART

The summer months are particularly challenging for managing graffiti and vandalism across the park system, and this year has been no exception. Several locations, including the buildings at Horseshoe Lake Park, Salsbury Point Park, Island Lake Park picnic shelter, Long Lake Park dock, Wildcat Lake Park restrooms, and South Kitsap Regional Park restrooms were heavily targeted with spray-painted graffiti. Staff responded swiftly to these incidents, covering all offensive graffiti within 24 hours and completely painting over or pressure washing the affected areas within 48 hours. These incidents significantly

impact resources and work plans, costing hundreds of dollars in paint and graffiti removal and redirect labor from other projects and needs. To better manage these costs, TRAK numbers will be implemented in Workday by the end of 2025 so that expenses related to vandalism can be quantified easier.

At South Kitsap Regional Park, staff also spent many hours cleaning up numerous rolls of wet toilet paper that had been discarded throughout the park just before a rainfall. Additionally, they have replaced five trash cans this season that were burned to the ground. Cameras are planned for the area; however, inadequate lighting, open gates after dusk, and lack of enforcement remain a challenge.

A number of abandoned camps were cleaned up by staff at Old Mill Park, Chico Salmon Park, and Illahee Preserve Heritage Park. Additionally, the HEART team is currently working to clear other active camps at Illahee Preserve Heritage Park and Old Mill Park so that staff can plan a cleanup date.

Natural Resources Program

Forest Stewardship and Restoration Open Houses and Site Visits

Staff spent the past year updating the Forest Restoration Policy and developed an implementation plan that is focused on continuing restoration actions in County parks to improve forest and ecological health. Staff presented these documents and provided information about the program over a series of open houses and site visits in July. Staff also provided a feedback form during this period to collect information from the community about the program. *Attached is a summary of these meetings and the results from the feedback form.*

- Supports PROS plan goals PR-2, PR-3, Objectives, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2 Actions 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.2.1, 3.2.1

Forest Stewardship and Restoration Projects

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park

Four units totaling 97 acres are permitted for selective thinning; the first unit in the mountain bike ride park is currently underway. Once complete, work will shift to the Ranger Corridor and then further south in the park. Completing all units is anticipated by the end of 2025.

- Supports PROS plan goals PR-2, Objectives, 2.1, 2.2, 3.2 Actions 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.2.1.

Volunteers

Volunteer Work Parties in July 2025

- Activity: 14 work parties (189 YTD)
- By the numbers...approximately:
 - 51 participants*
 - 120.5 hours of work party participation

Work Parties	# of Parties	# of Participants*	# of Hours
Stewards (Newberry, Kitsap Dog Parks, Coulter Creek, Chico Salmon Park, Hansville Greenway)	14	51	120.5
TOTAL	14	51	120.5

**Participants is a sum of number of participants at each work party, if an individual attended multiple work parties, they have been counted multiple times.*



Parks Department

1195 NW Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311
Mailing address: 614 Division, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366
Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385
www.kitsapgov.com/parks

Alex Wisniewski, Director

Location	Work performed
Chico Salmon Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invasive species removal
Coulter Creek Heritage Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invasive species removal
Guillemot Cove	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trail maintenance
Hansville Greenway	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trail maintenance and park patrolling
Illahee Preserve	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trail maintenance and park patrolling
Newberry Hill Heritage Park	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Invasive species removal• Trail maintenance

Partners worked with this period	Work performed
Mountain Vikes (youth mountain biking club) + D&D mountain Bike Club	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continued maintenance of adopted trail, The Hood
Kitsap Dog Parks Inc.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintaining the dog parks at Silverdale Rotary, Bandix, and Howe Farm.
KPTOS	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Litter pick up at Arness Roadside Park
Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Trail maintenance at ride park and Ranger corridor
Master Gardeners	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintaining gardens at JA & Anna Smith and Buck Lake parks.

- Supports PROS plan goals PR-2, PR-4 Objectives, 2.2, 4.2, 4.4 Actions 2.2.2, 4.2.1, 4.2.2, 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3, 4.4.4, 4.4.5, 4.4.6, 4.4.7

Planning & Capital Program

Planning

Capital Improvement Program Evaluation Process

Parks staff worked with members of the Capital Projects & Parks sub-committee of the Parks Advisory Board (PAB) to develop a process to evaluate capital projects. Projects were scored and evaluated using that process in July, which included balancing step to ensure a distribution of project types and locations across the three Commissioner Districts. Projects were also spread out across the CIP to adhere to Public Works Capital Facilities Division's annual staff capacity. The Department is a planning cycle away from larger, park development projects due to the planner role being vacant, as a result, the Draft CIP is frontloaded with smaller, construction-ready projects for 2026. The Draft CIP was shared with the BoCC on July 28th and will be shared with the PAB on August 20th.

- Supports PROS Plan Goals PR-1, & PR-5, Objectives 1.3, 1.4, 3.2, 3.3 & 4.1, Action 1.3.2

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan

The Board of County Commissioners voted to approve the 2025 PROS Plan by adopting Resolution No. 133-2025 on July 28, 2025. The Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO) approved the 2025 PROS Plan on August 1, 2025. The next

step for PROS Plan is a Comprehensive Plan Amendment to adopt the PROS Plan by reference (anticipated by December).

Capital

Fairgrounds and Events Center – Tennis Courts

Contract KC-465-17 memorializes the shared use of the tennis courts and Lobe Fields (2 & 3) at the and provides the authority for Central Kitsap School District to make capital improvements to the property. As such, Central Kitsap School District has begun work to rebuild the six tennis courts to repair drainage issues and replace the cracked surfacing. Construction began on June 16 and completion is targeted by September, before school begins. During construction, the tennis courts will be closed and the area fenced off for public safety. Additionally, the Castle Park playground will also be closed due to its proximity to the construction site and drive that will be used to access the tennis courts. Once complete, the courts will be striped for tennis and pickleball.

➤ *Supports PROS Plan Goal PR-1, PR-5*

Point No Point Park Beach and Shoreline Repair

The contract for construction services was approved on August 11, 2025 with Pacific Civil & Infrastructure Inc. The timeline includes mobilization beginning on August 25, construction beginning after Labor Day weekend, and completion is targeted to occur in November.

➤ *Supports PROS Plan Goal PR-6*

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park – North Gateway Trailhead

Construction began on July 7, 2025, and completion is anticipated in October.

➤ *Supports PROS Plan Goal PR-4, Objective 4.1, Action 4.1.2*

Eagle's Nest Deck Replacement

The project has been posted for bid proposals; deadline for submissions is August 28, 2025. Construction will begin once a contract is in place, likely in late September or October, 2025.

➤ *Supports PROS Plan Goal PR-5*

Suquamish Sport and Indianola Tennis Courts.

Based on results from the community survey, the Parks Department intends to move forward with pickleball and basketball uses at Suquamish Sports Court and tennis, pickleball, and basketball uses at Indianola Tennis Court, as well as new surfacing and fencing at both courts. Parks and Capital Facilities Division staff had a site visit with a new vendor on August 1, 2025. Cost estimates and projected schedules for the projects are expected mid-August.

➤ *Supports PROS Plan Goal PR-1, Objectives 1.3 & 1.4*

Water Taps at Port Gamble Ride Park

Parks and Public Works-Capital Facilities Division Staff conducted a site visit with Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance and Kitsap Public Utilities District on July 18, 2025. Based on the required water flow for ride park maintenance, a (1) 1" tap and (1) 2" tap will be installed. The installation timeline is not yet known but is expected to occur in 2025.

➤ *Supports PROS Plan Goal PR-6*



Kitsap County Parks Department | 614 Division Street M5-1 | Port Orchard, WA 98366

www.kitsapgov.com/parks | 360.337.5350 | parks@co.kitsap.wa.us

Kitsap County Parks
Capital Improvement Program 2026-2031
DRAFT - July 2025

Location	District	Project Description	Project Type	Project Purpose	Project Phase	Funding Source	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
1	Multiple parks	Accessible Trail Improvements	Trails	Improve trail accessibility and user experience	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management							
					Design, Engineering, Permits							
					Construction	Park Impact Fees	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000	\$ 40,000
					Construction Management							
2	Gordon Park	Replace synthetic turf on Gordon 1	Athletic Facilities	Synthetic turf is passed its useful life, has patches and tears	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning	Park Impact Fees						
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 50,000					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 200,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 1,000,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 150,000					
3	Gordon Park	Demolish house	Other	Area targeted for future park development	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 2,500					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 10,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 50,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 7,500					
4	Suquamish Sports Court	Resurface tennis court	Athletic Facilities	Tennis court is cracking and buckling	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 5,000					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 20,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 100,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 15,000					
5	Indianola Tennis Court	Resurface tennis court	Athletic Facilities	Tennis court is cracking and buckling	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 5,000					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 20,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 100,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 15,000					
6	Illahee Preserve Heritage Park	Land Acquisition	Land Acquisition	Illahee Creek Watershed protection	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Acquisition	Grants	\$ 600,000					
7	Horseshoe Lake Park	Demolish boat dock	Other	Dock is remnant of when Department used to rent boats and is passed its life and purpose	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 1,000					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 4,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 20,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 3,000					
8	Wynn-Jones Preserve	Demolish house	Other	Park rehabilitation	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 2,500					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 10,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 50,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 7,500					
9	Coulter Creek Heritage Park	Demolish Calvinwood house and laundry building	Other	Park rehabilitation	Environmental Evaluation							
					Planning							
					Project Management	REET II	\$ 3,000					
					Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 12,000					
					Construction	REET II	\$ 60,000					
					Construction Management	REET II	\$ 9,000					

10	Gorst Property	S	Demolish storage building	Other	Park rehabilitation	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$	500				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$	2,000				
						Construction	REET II	\$	10,000				
						Construction Management	REET II	\$	1,500				
11	SWP and Island Lake	C/N	Roof Replacements	Other	Replace roofs	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$	6,250				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$	25,000				
						Construction	REET II	\$	125,000				
						Construction Management	REET II	\$	18,750				
12	Village Greens Golf Course	S	Roof replacement	Other	Replace roof	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	General Fund	\$	3,000				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	General Fund	\$	12,000				
						Construction	General Fund	\$	60,000				
						Construction Management	General Fund	\$	9,000				
13	Illahee Preserve Heritage Park	C	Add restroom	Park Amenities	Improve user experience	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$	4,000				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$	16,000				
						Construction	REET II	\$	80,000				
						Construction Management	REET II	\$	12,000				
14	North Kitsap Heritage Park	N	Add restroom	Park Amenities	Improve user experience	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$	4,000				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$	16,000				
						Construction	REET II	\$	80,000				
						Construction Management	REET II	\$	12,000				
15	Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park	N	Update and adopt PGFHP Framework	Park Development	Update Draft Framework	Environmental Evaluation	Park Impact Fees	\$	10,000				
						Planning	Park Impact Fees	\$	100,000				
						Project Management							
						Design, Engineering, Permits							
						Construction							
						Construction Management							
16	Egdon Forest	N	Park Development	Park Development	Improve park access and user experience	Environmental Evaluation	Park Impact Fees	\$	40,000	\$	40,000		
						Planning							
						Project Management							
						Design, Engineering, Permits							
						Construction							
						Construction Management							
17	Coulter Creek	S	Master Plan, parking lot, etc.	Park Development	Improve park access and user experience	Environmental Evaluation	Park Impact Fees	\$	40,000				
						Planning	Park Impact Fees		\$	150,000			
						Project Management							
						Design, Engineering, Permits							
						Construction							
						Construction Management							
18	Silverdale Waterfront Park	C	Headwall Repair/Replacement	Other	Repair failing bulkhead	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$	50,000				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$	200,000				
						Construction	REET II		\$	1,000,000			
						Construction Management	REET II		\$	150,000			
19	South Kitsap Regional Park	S	Synthetic Turf Athletic Fields	Athletic Facilities	Replace natural grass fields with synthetic turf and lighting	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$	100,000				
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$	400,000				
						Construction	REET II		\$	2,000,000			
						Construction Management	REET II		\$	300,000			

20	Indianola Woodlands	N	Replace bridge over creek near beach	Park Amenities	Improve safety	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 2,500					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 10,000					
						Construction	REET II	\$ 50,000					
						Construction Management	REET II	\$ 7,500					
21	Salsbury Point Park	N	Dock Replacement	Park Amenities	Dock at end of life	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 15,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 60,000					
						Construction	REET II	\$ 300,000					
						Construction Management	REET II	\$ 45,000					
22	Gordon Park	C	Park Development (improve Gordon 2 with artificial turf, replace playground, picnic shelter, restrooms, expand disc golf course)	Park Development	Add park amenities and improve user experience	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning	Park Impact Fees	\$ 100,000					
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 150,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 600,000					
						Construction	REET II		\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000			
						Construction Management	REET II		\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000			
23	Long Lake Park	S	Culvert Replacement	Other	Replace culvert	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 1,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 4,000					
						Construction	REET II	\$ 20,000					
						Construction Management	REET II	\$ 3,000					
24	Point No Point	N	Stair and railing replacement on bluff	Park Amenities	Stairs at end of life	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 5,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 20,000					
						Construction	REET II	\$ 100,000					
						Construction Management	REET II	\$ 15,000					
25	Guillemot Cove	C	Improve trail crossing estuary/creek and remove cabin and headwall	Natural Resources	Improve condition of estuary	Environmental Evaluation	Park Impact Fees	\$ 5,000					
						Planning	Park Impact Fees						
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 25,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 100,000					
						Construction	REET II		\$ 500,000				
						Construction Management	REET II		\$ 75,000				
26	Newberry Hill	C	Parking Lot, restroom	Park Access	Improve park access and user experience	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 25,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 100,000					
						Construction	REET II		\$ 500,000				
						Construction Management	REET II		\$ 75,000				
27	Wick's Lake Park	S	Park Development	Park Development	Realize park plan from acquisition grant	Environmental Evaluation	Park Impact Fees	\$ 100,000					
						Planning	Park Impact Fees		\$ 75,000				
						Project Management							
						Design, Engineering, Permits							
						Construction							
						Construction Management							
28	Norwegian Point Park	N	Park Development (sync with Finn Creek Project)	Park Development	Renovate park, align with Finn Creek restoration project	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning	Park Impact Fees	\$ 50,000					
						Project Management	REET II	\$ 25,000					
						Design, Engineering, Permits	REET II	\$ 100,000					
						Construction	REET II		\$ 500,000				
						Construction Management	REET II		\$ 75,000				
29	Fairgrounds	C	Master Plan + Phased Construction	Event Facilities	Master Plan, Facility Improvements, ADA Upgrades, Energy Efficiencies, etc.	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning	Grant/KPFD	\$ 300,000					
						Project Management	Grant/KPFD		\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 100,000	
						Design, Engineering, Permits	Grant/KPFD		\$ 400,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 400,000	
						Construction	Grant/KPFD			\$ 2,000,000	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 1,500,000	
						Construction Management	Grant/KPFD			\$ 300,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 225,000	

30	Veteran's Memorial Park	S	Master Plan + Development	Park Development	Master Plan, Reimagine park based on community input	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning	TBD			\$ 100,000			
						Project Management	TBD				\$ 150,000		
						Design, Engineering, Permits	TBD				\$ 600,000		
						Construction	TBD					\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,500,000
						Construction Management	TBD					\$ 225,000	\$ 225,000
31	Banner Forest	S	Master Plan, Parking Lot, etc.	Park Access	Improve park access and user experience	Environmental Evaluation		Park Impact Fees		\$ 100,000			
						Planning		Park Impact Fees			\$ 75,000		
						Project Management		REET II				\$ 25,000	
						Design, Engineering, Permits		REET II				\$ 100,000	
						Construction		REET II					\$ 500,000
						Construction Management		REET II					\$ 75,000
32	South Kitsap Regional Park	S	Master Plan update + Construction	Park Development	Update Master Plan, improve amenities	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning		Park Impact Fees				\$ 100,000	
						Project Management		REET II					\$ 50,000
						Design, Engineering, Permits		REET II					\$ 200,000
						Construction		REET II					
						Construction Management		REET II					
33	Anderson Hill Athletic Fields	C	Improve parking lot and improve soccer fields with synthetic turf, lighting and restrooms	Athletic Facilities	Increase capacity of field use	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management		REET II					\$ 125,000
						Design, Engineering, Permits		REET II					\$ 500,000
						Construction		REET II					
						Construction Management		REET II					
34	Howe Farm	S	Renovate barn for special events	Event Facilities	Activate barn, improve event offerings	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning		Park Impact Fees					
						Project Management		REET II					\$ 37,500
						Design, Engineering, Permits		REET II					\$ 150,000
						Construction		REET II					
						Construction Management		REET II					
35	Horseshoe Lake	S	Park Development	Park Development	Renovate park, improve user experience	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning		Park Impact Fees					\$ 100,000
						Project Management		REET II					
						Design, Engineering, Permits		REET II					
						Construction		REET II					
						Construction Management		REET II					
36	Kola Kole Park	N	Community Engagement	Park Development	Better understand community use and desires for park	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management							
						Design, Engineering, Permits							
						Construction							
						Construction Management							
37	Location TBD	N	Athletic Field Development/Acquisition	Athletic Facilities	Improve athletic field accessibility	Environmental Evaluation							
						Planning							
						Project Management							
						Design, Engineering, Permits							
						Construction							
						Construction Management							


Total Annual	\$ 4,196,500	\$ 5,830,500	\$ 4,265,000	\$ 5,390,000	\$ 4,665,000	\$ 5,727,500	\$ 30,074,500
Acquisition	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600,000
Environmental Evaluation	\$ 90,000	\$ 145,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 335,000
Planning	\$ 200,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 175,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 1,150,000
Project Management	\$ 254,250	\$ 231,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 250,000	\$ 100,000	\$ 312,500	\$ 1,247,750
Design, Engineering, Permits	\$ 1,017,000	\$ 924,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 400,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ 4,991,000
Construction	\$ 1,735,000	\$ 3,470,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 3,500,000	\$ 18,705,000
Construction Management	\$ 260,250	\$ 520,500	\$ 450,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 525,000	\$ 2,805,750
Project Costs	\$ 4,196,500	\$ 5,830,500	\$ 4,265,000	\$ 5,390,000	\$ 4,665,000	\$ 5,727,500	\$ 30,074,500
REET II	\$ 3,182,500	\$ 5,145,500	\$ 3,450,000	\$ 1,725,000	\$ 125,000	\$ 1,637,500	\$ 15,265,500
Park Impact Fees	\$ 330,000	\$ 385,000	\$ 215,000	\$ 115,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 140,000	\$ 1,325,000
Grants	\$ 600,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 600,000
KPFD	\$ -	\$ 300,000	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,800,000	\$ 2,675,000	\$ 2,225,000	\$ 8,500,000
General Fund	\$ 84,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 84,000
North (District 1)	9	4	1	--	--	--	--
South (District 2)	7 (3 w/out demos)	4	3	2	4	5	5
Central (District 3)	7 (6 w/out demos)	5	4	2	2	2	2
Land Acquisition	1	--	--	--	--	--	--

Park Access	--	1	2	1	1	1
Park Amenities	4	2	--	--	--	--
Athletic Facilities	4	1	--	--	1	1
Event Facilities	--	1	1	1	2	2
Trails	1	1	1	1	1	1
Natural Resources	--	1	1	--	--	--
Park Development	5	5	4	2	2	3
Other	8	2	--	--	--	--


DRAFT

COMMUNITY BUILDING RENTALS

● 2023 ● 2024 ● 2025




ATHLETIC FIELD USAGE IN HOURS CENTRAL




ATHLETIC FIELD USAGE IN HOURS


SOUTH




PICNIC SHELTER RENTAL DAYS



FAIRGROUNDS EVENT DAYS




FAIRGROUNDS EVENT DAYS




SPECIAL PARK EVENT DAYS

● 2024 ● 2025



SPECIAL PARK EVENT DAYS



TOTAL NUMBER OF EVENT DAYS

Forest Stewardship and Restoration Policy and Implementation Plan Outreach Meeting Summary:

In July of 2025, Parks staff hosted 6 public meetings to provide information about the update to the Forest Stewardship and Restoration Policy and the 10-year Implementation Plan. We also advertised and hosted a feedback form to solicit input from the community regarding these documents and the programs.

Public meetings:

At the public meetings, the majority of staff interactions were positive, and community members expressed support for past work and future direction of the program. Community concerns were also expressed, and staff was able to effectively hold conversations about the ecological need, financial realities of the program, and future planning efforts.

Events held in Districts 1 and 3 had an overall sentiment of community support for the program and positive feedback on both the policy and plan.


At the events held in District 2 there was a very vocal sentiment of opposition to any restoration work being performed specifically in Banner Forest Heritage Park. This is the only park where in which a segment of the community disagreed with the data indicating that there is treatment need. However, there were also voices of support for this work amongst the community. There appears to be much confusion amongst the detractors about what is being proposed, with some in the community incorrectly stating that the department is clearcutting the forest. When staff provide correct information to people seeking clarity, it was generally received well and appreciated.

Feedback Form


A feedback form was advertised at all public meetings, outreach and online. This form had questions about the parks of interest (proposed park locations for restoration), how the community would like to be informed about upcoming projects and planning efforts, what types of projects they would like to be involved in, project phasing, and what additional information they were interested in. There was also an opportunity to provide unstructured feedback and ask questions. 57 responses were received.

Feedback Form Results


1. The majority of respondents indicated they were interested in Banner Forest Heritage Park, followed by Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park and Newberry Hill Heritage Park. Respondents could select multiple parks.



2. Respondents indicated they most strongly prefer email notification to alert them to upcoming projects or events. Other suggestions included SMS text, Face to face meetings, direct mail, town halls, email newsletters




3. Respondents' interest in involvement in program activities was well distributed across all categories.



4. Respondents were asked about project phasing and their preference between:

- **All work performed at once.**
 - **Pros:** The entire park is impacted for a shorter period of time; potential cost and logistical efficiencies.
 - **Cons:** A large portion of the park would be closed to recreation during construction; may result in significant visual changes in the short term.
- **Small projects performed over a number of years.**
 - **Pros:** Only small areas of the park are closed at any given time; visual impacts are limited to specific project zones.
 - **Cons:** More frequent disruptions over a longer period; likely higher overall project costs.

5. Majority of respondents preferred smaller projects performed over a number of years.



6. Desired additional information included:

- More information on project specifics, environmental assessments, and operational details.
 - These will be determined during subsequent planning efforts.
- Annual project timelines

- References supporting program objectives.
 - Many of the studies used to guide the program are listed in the references section of the Policy document. We intend to include links to outside references on our website when it is updated
- Request for county management information beyond the scope of this program including overall park plans, ADA accessibility, and safety and security information.

7. General comments were left by 45 of 56 respondents. Full comment and response matrix is attached. Themes from these comments are included in the Overall Themes summary below.

Based on comments provided in both open-ended questions, each response was evaluated for support of the program.

<i>Program Sentiment</i>	<i>Response Count</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Against</i>	14	25%
<i>Neutral</i>	37	66%
<i>Supportive</i>	5	9%
<i>Total Responses</i>	56	

All responses with negative sentiments towards the materials presented indicated the respondent was specifically against restoration of Banner Forest.

Additional contacts:

During and after the public meetings, the department received emails from several community members with questions, comments, or concerns about the program. Each email received a response from staff answering questions and providing resources.

Overall Themes:

Ecological Assessments and Protections:

Many community members had questions about how impacts to wildlife, wetlands, native plants, and ecosystems in general will be assessed. They also had concerns about invasive species flushes post treatment. These are all very valid concerns and are a part of the analysis and planning that happens at the Park and Project planning levels.

Program operations

Some community members, particularly those with concerns about Banner Forest Heritage Park, expressed that due to funding structure, they feel staff are unable to be objective about ecological need vs revenue.

Some community members expressed a desire to see alternative thinning methods used (hand thinning, horses) and for there to be an everyday presence of Park Staff at the project site to oversee the work of the contractor.

Community comments reflect a larger distrust in the County as a whole to be able to perform work effectively. General sentiments from the south part of the county reflect feelings of being either ignored or taken advantage of. This has led to an uphill battle for Parks staff to be viewed as experts in their field and capable of performing high quality, unbiased work.

In summary, overall engagement and feedback received during this process was positive and productive. Negative sentiments toward the program were only expressed regarding Banner Forest Heritage Park, though, there are many in the community who see value in the proposed restoration work at this location.

Public Meeting Timeline:

Date	Dist.	Meeting Type	Location	Attendance	Staff
7/21/25	1	Open House	Village Green, Kingston, WA	38	Commissioner Rolfes, Alex Wisniewski, Chuck Cuzzetto, Kevin Ceder, Irene Weber
7/22/25	3	Open House	Eagles Nest, Silverdale, WA	11	Commissioner Walters, Alex Wisniewski, Chuck Cuzzetto, Kevin Ceder, Irene Weber
7/23/25	2	Open House	Commissioner's Chambers, Port Orchard, WA	16	Alex Wisniewski, Alex Hardy, Chuck Cuzzetto, Kevin Ceder, Irene Weber
7/28/25	1	Site Visit	Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park	18	Kevin Ceder, Irene Weber
7/29/25	3	Site Visit	Newberry Hill Forest Heritage Park	13	Commissioner Walters, Alex Wisniewski, Chuck Cuzzetto, Kevin Ceder, Irene Weber
7/30/25	2	Site Visit	Banner Forest Heritage Park	~64-68	Commissioner Root, Alex Wisniewski, Alex Hardy, Chuck Cuzzetto, Kevin Ceder, Irene Weber

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

General Questions and Comments				
Name	Topic	Sub-topic	Comment	Response
Tom Doty	Natural Resources	Aquatic resources	<p>I am a retired steward at North Kitsap Heritage Park (NKHP). I have had occasion to visit Beaver Pond there weekly (every 2-3 days in fall and winter) beginning in 2013, continuing until 2021. Because I am a vertebrate population biologist, with a history of conducting funded population studies of fish, amphibians, reptiles and mammals, I was assigned the duty of culvert maintenance at NKHP.</p> <p>The large corrugated steel culvert on Spine Line east was problematic. A failed 'beaver deceiver' allowed unrestrained access to the mouth of the culvert by attentive beavers. Flooding of Spine Line trail was the inevitable result (inconveniencing visitors as this is one of only three entrances to the park). I cleared obstructions hundreds of times over my 9-year tenure in an effort to keep Spine Line open.</p> <p>My primary research interest for 30 years was amphibian population dynamics. I ran a continuous monitoring program of a community of eleven species of amphibians in Rhode Island for 30 years (1970-2000), involving daily visits to three study ponds (one of the longest such studies on record). A lifelong love of wetlands and decades of field experience (teaching and research) leads me to comment on what I see (or, more correctly, don't see) at Beaver Pond in NKHP.</p> <p>Everywhere I've lived, prolific duckweed covering the surface of a pond is considered an indicator of culturally eutrophic conditions. Because the headwaters of Beaver Creek (and Bear Creek to the west) originate on golf and residential property south of NKHP, this proximity suggests to me a source of a potentially elevated nutrient load.</p> <p>But it is not simple nutrient input that I'm most concerned with at Beaver Pond.</p> <p>While I make no claims as to invertebrate expertise, I have always admired aquatic bugs for their multitude of moving parts! My ongoing impression there has been of depressed populations of typical wetland species. Fewer scary bugs than one might expect. Despite the varied seasons I have tended the culvert, I have never heard a true frog chorus there. Scattered individuals only. Stewards have seined that pond and while we found a few salamander egg masses, I've never seen larvae. It seems to me to be a strangely quiet pond. Understand this is a personal opinion. I have no data. Just a suspicion based on experience.</p> <p>A small group of concerned citizens, alerted to the Pulte silt fence obstruction disaster leading to the mortality of hundreds of migrating newts a couple of years ago, have taken an interest in Beaver Pond and it's apparently depauperate fauna. We would like to conduct water quality tests there, looking for toxins (herbicide/pesticide residue). Respectfully.</p> <p>Tom Doty, Ph.D., Biological Sciences</p>	Management of this specific aquatic resource is beyond the scope of these documents, but this will be passed on to staff
Brandy Williams	Communication	Private Landowners	Interaction with private landowners with forests	Communication with neighboring landowners will be a part of subsequent park and project specific planning processes

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Mariko Hamashima	Public Input		No additional questions - looking for ways to be more involved!	Comment noted
Jessica Myette	Ecologic Need	Banner	This needs to be stopped. You have to many people that enjoy this beautiful forest and take care of it. You plan on taking down 400 acres of trees out of 636 acres? This will devastate the forest and it will not recover. Forests have natural processes like nutrient cycling, water filtration, and decomposition that contribute to their health and stability. How can you say that taking over 62% of the forest is healthy? The diverse array of plants and animals within a forest ecosystem creates a complex web of interactions that can contribute to resilience and self-regulation. You will destroy the habitat, the life of the forest that is today will be gone. Let the people be heard in the community before you act. You have to many that oppose this plan. Thank you.	Wholesale removal of 400 acres of trees is not what is being proposed. This plan identified potential need for selective thinning work to support forest health in Banner Forest. Native plants and wildlife protections are of paramount importance and will be considered as project feasibility assessments continue
Rebecca Wood	Recreation Impacts	Banner	I am particularly interested in Banner Forest. This park is unique because it provides a wilderness type experience close to town. It is highly valued by mushroom collectors, birders, hikers, runners, dog walkers, mountain bikers and horse riders.	This program aims to aid the long-term health of the forest which will enhance and maintain the current recreation experience.
John Williams	Techniques		Girdling trees can thin a forest gradually, allowing the forest to adapt as slow changes occur rather than the ecosystem shock of cutting down a bunch of trees at once. It is very inexpensive and also leaves the dead trees in the forest instead of removing all that biomass from forests already deprived of biomass for 100+ years.	Girdling trees is a technique that has been considered as a part of our restoration program. It may be used as one of many techniques.
Jim Heytvelt			none	Comment noted
Marion Allen	Natural Resources	Wetlands	Would like to see comprehensive map of wetlands in each park.	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Susan Anderson	Ownership	Rude Road	Regarding Rude Road property: Is this property on track to be given to the city of Poulsbo, thus insuring public ownership & access. Park Restoration presentation notes that property was logged in the early 1990's, has been reforested naturally, & "lacking large trees." This inherently does not make sense. I know that this property was previously under State DNR ownership/management & logged quite a few years ago, hence there are no large trees. Public access is an issue since Rude Road is a private road.	The Rude Road parcels are either under Parks or County Tax Title ownership. Previous plans to transfer to the City of Poulsbo did not proceed. The naturally regenerated parcel lacks large legacy trees and is not currently on a trajectory to develop such trees. Selective thinning to promote legacy trees is proposed. Public access for recreation is beyond the scope of this program.
Susan Anderson	Communication	Document Clarity	It would help to have page numbers on this document so that specific concerns can be more easily & accurately referenced.	Page numbers are provided in both the Policy and Plan documents at the bottom center of each page.
Daniel Johnson	Ecologic Need	Invasive Species	My wife and I walk in Banner Forest almost every day and see no positive connection with this so call restoration and the health of the forest. The forest floor is a shade environment. Clearing away trees will damage the	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

			shade and cause undesirable vegetation to gain a foothold. First will be blackberry and eventually Scotch Broom. We don't understand how the trees are the problem in the forest. The \$700,000 will be spent before anyone notices and the trees will take a generation to regrow. We ask to please leave Banner Forest as is.	will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Lauren Loar	Techniques	Banner	I am concerned about the logging planned for Banner forest and what type of company would be selected to do this. How does the county plan to monitor the work the work planned in the future? After seeing the results of South Kitsap Regional Park's logging for other reasons, I'm concerned how this would actually be implemented. I live right next to Banner park and am also concerned about how wildlife would be disturbed and to what degree their habitat would be affected, especially since this is a heritage park.	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans. Monitoring of treatment areas are planned as a crucial component of our restoration process. This will help us identify issues or other restoration needs as they arise
Bernadette Henzi	Ownership	Banner	What does the original land transfer of Banner Forest from DNR to Kitsap County allow regarding logging and other projects within the Park? When did this transfer occur and is this document available to the public? What is the Parks original mission and purpose stated in its creation. How much say does the public have regarding logging activity within the Park?	History of acquisition can be found in this document: https://www.kitsap.gov/parks/Documents/BannerForest_ManagementPlan_2015.pdf
Julie Tappero	Ecologic Need	Banner	I was part of the group that literally saved Banner Forest years ago. I don't want the County to do ANYTHING! You weren't there and you don't know what we went through to keep it a Forest. Leave it alone. Hands off.	Comment noted
Endolyne Farrows	Techniques	Invasive Species	<p>I'm concerned about Banner Forest. We own some forest around our house and had Austin (the actual arborist) come and talk about tree thinning. So in that sense, I understand that thinning is necessary. However, the way the trees will be thinned (large machines that will disrupt all the land) and the rate (all at once) feels very dangerous to me. Specifically, I've seen how even the side mowers come in and kill all the native salal and while it does grow back the minute there's nothing there we see a ton of scotchbroom and himalayan blackberry. Both are already on the edge of the forest and I have encountered tree of heaven on the trail as well.</p> <p>The reality seems to me therefore if we do this more than very slowly and with strong invasive mitigation plans that don't involve spraying, we're going to destroy the land even though it does need to be thinned.</p> <p>I'm not pretending I know a lot about this, but I have been fighting scotchbroom in my yard for the full five years I've lived and it is an intensive project. The trees aren't going to be able to thrive fast enough. Not in this climate.</p>	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans. During these planning processes we will also assess pacing of treatment to minimize disruption to the park.
Mark Hogden	Ecologic Need		Keep up the good work. I'm 100% in favor of returning the tree density to a more natural state.	Comment noted

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Mark Wentzel	Techniques	Banner	Careful thinning of the forest by removing the smaller and defective trees will result in a healthier environment for all of the plants and animals in the forest. Unhealthy trees become susceptible to insects which eventually infect even the larger most vigorous trees. Dense stands of trees a much greater fire risk than healthy ones. The Banner Forest is surrounded by residential areas that are in danger should a fire get started. Look at the South Kitsap Regional Park in Port Orchard to see the results of previous successful thinning operations.	Comment noted
Judy Arbogast	Recreation Impacts	Wildlife Impacts	What will be the impact on animals living in the forest? What is impact on current users and neighbors [including walkers, bike riders, horse back riders, nature lovers, bird lovers]	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans. During these planning processes we will also assess pacing of treatment to minimize disruption to the park.
Susan Courville	Communication	Banner	The community served and near Banner Forest Park needs to be better informed. As it stands, the distrust felt about the county, state, or whoever's practices seems to be more focused on revenue. We recommend this park to friends who want to experience a forest immersion experience, NOT a groomed city park type of experience. As a neighbor to the park we have transient wildlife coming and going and feel the ecological balance would be terribly disrupted for too long. If trees need to be removed, use only horse logging practices, NOT heavy machinery. Impact to areas is much less, as we have observed from living elsewhere and seeing the effects. Again, to remove diseased trees - Use Horse Logging Practices.	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans. During these planning processes we will also assess pacing of treatment to minimize disruption to the park.
Susan M.	Techniques		We used to ride bikes at Newberry. After the clear cut the forest was wide open in areas making it drier. The roads were a mess so that bike riding was impossible. Perhaps the extra wood and dried branches have been removed but when all was finished, those dried branches could have contributed to a fire. I hope the current logging company does a better job.	Disruption and needed repair to trail systems will be a part of Park and Project planning processes
Bryan Inglin	Funding		What does the department do with the "extra" revenue beyond funding the positions that develop and implement the forest stewardship? I'm not sure if the tradeoff for taking extra trees is worth the revenue. I believe some of the wood, preferably Large Woody Debris, be left on site to assist habitat enhancement.	Trees will only be removed if there is an ecological need for their removal. We leave some of the felled trees onsite for habitat enhancement including creation of habitat piles and large log analogues. All revenue generated from the sale of any trees removed in the course of restoration projects is used to support the natural resource program including hiring professional natural resource management staff, funding habitat restoration projects including wildlife, native vegetation, and wetland projects, and overall conservation of natural resources within KC Parks.

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Lauri Boren	County Management	Banner	<p>When are you going to be providing the services we already pay for? It's been years, and things only get worse. You are focusing on logging instead of managing the county ethically? This "thinning" plan is in no way ethical.</p> <p>No logging trucks. No logging machines. Nothing like that to build roads to log further in the future. This is not the county cash cow to slaughter. I prefer you NOT proceed with this logging plan. It is absolutely not okay. SK has a horrible reputation for taking care of messes they make and until you get those under control in the other places you have had "thinned" you should not plan this way. If what you were doing WERE in the best interest of the forest, in the best interest of the community you would have the plan and funds in place for remediation right now. At present, it appears that you are only interested in removing the profit/trees from our local forest park.</p>	<p>Comment noted. As described in the implementation plan, the original funding structure to restore these forest is no longer economically viable. We are exploring other funding sources to continue the restoration program including conservation grants.</p>
Mike Collins	Planning	Banner	<p>Until you have a plan to mitigate the aftermath of logging 519 of 636 acres, and an actual need, leave Banner Forest alone.</p>	<p>No actions will be undertaken until additional planning efforts are complete including a Park Forest Stewardship Plan and Project Plans. Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.</p>
denise drevdahl	County Management	Banner	<p>My family has serious doubts about the "restoration" planned for Banner Forest and that county officials can be trusted. Thinning ends up looking like clear-cutting; my understanding is that the county has little to no plan re: what to do with the invasive species (scotchbroom, blackberry) that the "thinning" will foster (relying on 'volunteers' to do this work is a non-starter). Under the guise of "forest health", what it looks like is logging so that \$\$ can be made...and ending up with a 'forest' that no one will want to use. We need to 'get over' the idea that all of 'nature' needs to be 'managed'...things were just fine until humans went in and destroyed, killed, hunted, chopped down everything. I've been listening to folks talk about this and nearly everyone (except the loggers, county folks, etc.) are in support of the proposed work. If you truly want to engage the community in a conversation, please listen to the local folks who use and love this park. thanks.</p>	<p>Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.</p>

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Megan Thompson	Techniques		I understand that it is too expensive to mark the trees to be cut, but leaving it at the discretion of the logger, with only weekly oversight, leaves too much room for the logger to take down the bigger, more desirable trees to make more money. There needs to be more oversight for new access roads and exactly which trees are to be left. I would be happy to volunteer to provide some of that oversight.	<p>In addition to the cost reasons, there are also safety reasons for why we don't mark each individual tree in a treatment area. When the operator is actively working, commonly a marked tree isn't feasible or safe to take down so they will have to pivot to a different tree (of similar size/age/need for removal) so marking the trees ahead of time doesn't always go exactly to plan, then we end up with a bunch of trees with spray paint on them in the woods. We've worked very hard to train the crew hired to perform this work to do so accurately and up to the specifications of each project. At this point we are very confident in their abilities. We do mark special sensitive areas that we do not want cutting to occur in, which is more efficient than marking every tree to take down. The thinning crew gets paid to perform exactly the work that is prescribed. There's no benefit to them to secretly take more or larger trees.</p> <p>As a part of how we train the operators, we do mark some trees in a small part of the restoration area before the operator starts. After they work through that area, they are well calibrated of what types of trees want him to leave, what types of trees to remove, and the conditions we are looking for after the restoration treatment. Park Forester is on-site during the initial cutting to help guide the operator and address any questions or concerns. Our operator has spent the majority of his 30+ year career doing thinning and restoration project and like to leave forests to grow and develop bigger trees.</p>
Carol Price	Communication		The public needs to be involved in our parks, especially in planning and decision making. Let's talk to each other. We need more time to read this document and make comment!!! Please have a Town Hall in each district...this is difficult, for sure. We could truly have an amazing parks system in this county.....	Thank you for participating in this community involvement and feedback gathering process. Town halls would be coordinated by the Commissioner's office, we will pass this request onto their staff.
Kristine Goss	County Management		The county is destroying our county parks and forests under the guise of "restoration" the entire county population needs to step up and confront and stop the people making these decisions for profit and put in place people who actually care about the environment vs the money. Stop pretending it's about anything else than the cash.	Comment noted
Shannon Bauman	Ecologic Need	Banner	I am very much in favor of thinning the Banner forest. The future health of the forest will depend on it and the sooner it is completed the better it will be. It is probably past due. Visiting older parks like Point Defiance or others in Seattle shows what it could be if properly managed.	Comment noted
Rebecca Sliger	Techniques	Timing	I strongly prefer smaller projects over a number of years. I recognize that we need to think long term about the needs of the forest. We also need to think about the lifespan of people. If we do this in one big project, and the forest is just a mess for the next twenty years, I won't have the opportunity to use the forest. I love this place. Do it in stages so there is always part of the forest that is a beautiful place for people to enjoy.	Comment noted

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Craig Richmond	Ecologic Need	Banner	<p>I want to voice my support for the thinning plans at the Banner Forest Heritage Park. This land never got the thinning it needed after being commercially planted and as a result there's too many trees that are overcrowded and struggling for resources. I reject the belief that many are sharing that the county seeks only to sell the timber to make money and instead believe the science in forest management practices that will improve the health of this forest.</p> <p>I use this park weekly for walking and mountain biking and know this thinning work will both impact my use and also the appearances of the park in the short term, but I also know it will help this loved park continue to grow and thrive in the long term.</p>	Comment noted
Chris Magill	Planning	Banner	How do we block your plan on cutting our Forest? We want no action taken. Take no action in Banner Forest.	Comment noted. Please contact your commissioner
Beverly Parsons	Communication		<p>What early involvement did the general public have regarding the Forest Restoration and Stewardship Program before the recent July presentations and site visits?</p> <p>How does this plan connect and work along side the PROS plan? As I now go back and look at the PROS plan after seeing these plans, I'm not finding a reference to a Forest Restoration and Stewardship Plan being under development. Why was it not part of the PROS plan?</p> <p>I support having town halls throughout the county about the Program as recently called for by Oran Root. While it's useful to have them in each of the 3 districts in the county, it is also important to encourage the public from different parts of the county to attend those in other districts than their own to get familiar with the situation across the county.</p> <p>I have additional comments but I'll submit them separately before your August 4 end of day comment period. Thanks for all your work on this important topic.</p> <p>It would be helpful to have a review of the Forest Restoration and Stewardship Plans by different expert perspectives on forest restoration and stewardship. I would like to see people like Joshua Wright (jwrighter@gmail.com), John Talbreth (jtalberth@sustainable-economy.org), Dominick DellaSala (dominick@wild-heritage.org) be asked to review these plans as well as people from Clallam County such as members of the Lower Elwha Klallam tribe and Elizabeth Dunne (edunne@earthlaw.org) who are actively engaged in these issues. We need to be sure that the most recent research on these topics from multiple perspectives are considered. Once they have reviewed these plans please then have a public forum with these people to help the public understand the issues and alternatives. We need to consider our work within Kitsap County Parks in the bigger context of our state and environmental conditions even more broadly. We also need to look at alternative revenue sources rather than simply harvesting trees. These include carbon credits and other options. The people mentioned above are actively working with the Washington State Lands Group, a working</p>	<p>These document updates have been discussed in Park Advisory Board Meetings since 2024. The Parks Advisory board is comprised of community representatives from across the county. These meetings are open to the public and minutes from these meetings are available on the parks website.</p> <p>This policy and plan supports PROS goals PR-1: Promote a sustainable parks system that fosters opportunities for both active and passive recreation, encourages healthy lifestyles, safeguards natural habitats, and preserves and enhances significant environmental and historical resources. Goal PR-2: Develop and implement natural resource management plans to protect biodiversity and cultural resources, establish buffer zones and wildlife corridors, adopt sustainable land management practices, and preserve cultural heritage sites through interpretive signage, educational programs, and collaboration with local tribes and cultural experts.</p> <p>Town Halls will be coordinated by the commissioners offices,</p> <p>References and review panel participants are noted in the Policy document</p>

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

			group of the Pacific NW Forest Climate Alliance. They are also actively engaged in issues related to DNR's harvesting and alternatives.	
Jeff	Ecologic Need		NO LOGGING SHOULD EVER BE ALLOWED. LET NATURE DO ITS AMAZING THING!!!!	Comment noted
Shirley messner	Ecologic Need	Banner	Please see answer in Question #9, Asking to only to hand cut,PLEASE DO NOT CLOSE THIS PARK TO HEAVY EQUIPMENT (rapping the land). This is the last park that has been untouched with natural habitat in kitsap county. It is also very concerning that you have let go of the volunteers that take pride in this park in a natural way without totally wiping out our trees and foliage. I feel the commissioner has already made up there minds which is a concern. Only get rid of diseased trees which I have found none. Many people value this park in its untouched natural setting. I fully understand that keeping trail maintained is a goal. This can be accomplished with volunteers and hand work w/o major heavy equipment. Trails are very close together with the foliage helps keep the trails separate. Many come out to this park wanting peace and not running into people the next trail over. We are not concerned about fallen trees, commonsense tells one to stay out of wooded areas in wind storms. Please do not take AWAY ONE LAST PEACEFUL PLACE IN Kitsap county.	Changes to the recreational experience at this park are not proposed in this plan
Lisa Reddish	Communication		Good luck educating the uneducated on why restoration and maintenance is needed. Many of my rural neighbors hate any type of change.	Comment noted
Doug Hayman	Communication		I'd like to see what the forest experts you've put together have submitted as individual comments and their combined recommendations.	References and review panel participants are noted in the Policy document
Carly Sullivan			Not at this time, thank you!	Comment noted
Deborah Weinmann	County Management	Volunteers	It would be worth it to pay a volunteer coordinator who can galvanize community members. It would need to be a person with good organizational skills and someone who has the ability to rationally and realistically prioritize projects.	Volunteer management it outside of the scope of these documents but we will pass this information on to staff.
Katherine Ander	Communication	Social Media	I don't personally use Facebook, but many people use it exclusively. It is an important way to reach out & connect with the public & perhaps correct inaccurate on line statements.	Comment noted

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Rebecca Stansbury	Funding		<p>Involve the community in the planning of this project. Listen and adapt. it's our park. Our home - not yours. Treat us as partners who have value and deserve true respect. For example if you truly were interested in thinning out certain trees you wouldn't hire a logging company with fancy machines, you would hire arborists who use teams of horses to draw out timber without damaging the forest. The choices for the project you describe (as in the Kitsap Sun article today) suggest you are solely focused on getting timber \$\$\$\$\$. You then, will target all the largest trees first, healthy and attractive - real assets - and have them cut down for no ecological reason. Merely monetary. Be honest with the public! There are other ways to generate income. Listen to the public - those of us who pay all the tax dollars.</p> <p>Explain why clear cutting (let's be honest) Banner Forest was all done in secret. Explain why there's a sudden rush to do this 'project' (which just happens to put \$700,000 into your pockets) when the county is experiencing budget short falls. You don't do that while telling us it is just out of sheer concern for the ecology. Banner Forest is the jewell of south kitsap. You are talking about destroying it, inviting in so much damned sunlight that scotch broom will crowd out the understory you say you care so much about. There will be no literal forest left, no shade, no mushrooms. Might as well throw in another gawd awful baseball field.</p>	<p>No actions will be undertaken until additional planning efforts are complete including a Park Forest Stewardship Plan and Project Plans. Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans. Additional community outreach will also occur during these planning processes.</p>
-------------------	---------	--	--	---

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

April Ryan	Communication	<p>It's important to have recognized experts review the Forest Restoration and Stewardship Plans, including Joshua Wright, John Talbreth, Dominick DellaSala, members of the Lower Elwha Klallam tribe, and Elizabeth Dunne. Their insights would help ensure that the latest research is considered. Stephen Kropp from the Legacy Forest Defense Coalition and David Perk from the WA State Lands Working Group could also provide valuable perspectives.</p> <p>After the review, holding a public forum would help the community understand the issues and alternatives. It's vital to see how our work relates to broader state environmental conditions and to explore alternative revenue sources, such as carbon credits. Public involvement in the planning process is crucial, especially since there seems to be a pattern of neglect in community engagement in certain areas.</p> <p>It's necessary to determine how the Forest Restoration and Stewardship Plan integrates with the PROS plan, which lacked sufficient mentions of the stewardship plan's development.</p> <p>I support the idea of town halls across the county to encourage public participation and ensure that all voices are heard. Regarding public engagement, the Draft Forest Stewardship Policy Update on the Parks website is dated October 2024 but labeled as Draft June 2025. It's unclear if public input was gathered during the initial planning stages. The plan's Outreach and Collaboration section suggests that while they aim to inform the public, it may come across more as seeking to justify decisions already made rather than genuinely listening to community feedback.</p> <p>Lastly, the plan doesn't clearly show how the economics of tree harvesting plays into the decision-making process. It is understandable that the public questions whether 'thinning' is based on forest health or balancing the budget with timber income. Please provide some facts.</p>	<p>These document updates have been discussed in Park Advisory Board Meetings since 2024. The Parks Advisory board is comprised of community representatives from across the county. These meetings are open to the public and minutes from these meetings are available on the parks website.</p> <p>This policy and plan supports PROS goals PR-1: Promote a sustainable parks system that fosters opportunities for both active and passive recreation, encourages healthy lifestyles, safeguards natural habitats, and preserves and enhances significant environmental and historical resources. Goal PR-2: Develop and implement natural resource management plans to protect biodiversity and cultural resources, establish buffer zones and wildlife corridors, adopt sustainable land management practices, and preserve cultural heritage sites through interpretive signage, educational programs, and collaboration with local tribes and cultural experts.</p> <p>Town Halls will be coordinated by the commissioners offices References and review panel participants are noted in the Policy document</p> <p>The plan discusses that this program was originally designed to be self-funding. It concludes that this is no longer economically viable based on current markets and forest needs. Alternative funding to support forest restoration including grants is being explored.</p>
------------	---------------	---	---

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

None Provided	County Management		Any INFORMATION at all. The slide show presentation contains goals only, nothing about how the choices will be made or how many decades you expect the thinned/damaged "forest" to restore itself to the perfect ecosystem you propose. Where is the specific plan for Banner Forest? Why does the conservation easement need to be vitiated? Small tress are suitable only for paper or OSB that is not a practical market, so large trees must be removed for the plan to pay. Large trees will take decades to replace from bare ground or remaining small trees. Will the county follow up long enough to see that happen (I will be long dead) or will they just sell to developers to lower taxes the developers and their tax base enlarging customers would otherwise have to pay? Does increasing the growth under the canopy not cause increased risk of fire sufficient to destroy the trees and spead to the canopy, or do you expect the "wildlife" to include a heard of elk to thin it? How will the fuel that results from felling small trees be removed? County foresters in the past eagerly granted native people permission for the unsightly (and likely damaging) stripping of cedar bark, what pressure group.are they cowntowing to here? Yes, Banner Forest is the sad remains of a timber plantation, but so is much of Western Washington. So little is left that does not serve as a place to picnic and play frisbee, that it is hard to trust that anyone is interested in anything that does not make any county land into a "park" or a housing project. True, it is no longer possible to preserve anything in Washington that is not (for now) under federal control,, but benign neglect is probably more dependable than "improvement."	No actions will be undertaken until additional planning efforts are complete including a Park Forest Stewardship Plan and Project Plans. Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans. Additional community outreach will also occur during these planning processes.
Mara Mote Lauterjung	Natural Resources		See above - would like to subscribe to any newsletter to be sure I don't miss alerts. I wasn't aware of the July 30 meeting and would have like to have attended. Would like more details on the specifics of work to be done - I appreciate the available presentation deck showing what parties are involved in assessment - would like more detail on that assessment process and what will be done to ensure wildlife is not disrupted during this process. Would also like to have included any scholarly/professional counter proposals. Over 500 acres thinned in two years sounds very aggressive. And seeing how invasive vegetation like scotch broom haven't been mitigated well I join others in expressing concern. What native plants will be introduced/reintroduced and how? Will any wildlife be reintroduced to aide the restoration? What is the accountability that the process will truly begin and remain in the best interest of the land?	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans which have not yet been performed for Banner forest. The implementation plan simply identifies areas in which restoration need has been identified.
Bobby Lauterjung	County Management	Banner	Not in favor of Banner Forrest thinning. Do not have faith in county's ability to properly manage the cleared spaces to prevent invasive species. Leave it as is.	Comment noted
Janet Wyatt	County Management		If the above questions have been brought up, where is the project at with the park accessibility.	Recreation and trail management is outside the scope of this program, but we will pass this information along to staff

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Additional Information Requested				
Name	Info Type	Info Sub Type	Comment	Response
Tom Doty	Natural Resource		Plans for protection of temporary ponds and intermittent streams. Plans for leaving large wood on the ground following restorative thinning. Plans for enacting federal wetland protection (i.e. buffers, etc.)	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Brandy Williams	County Management		Notice about commissioner votes	Commissioner votes are public record and are available on the BOCC webpage
Rebecca Wood	Planning		Please provide planning information on Banner Forest.	Additional planning for Banner Forest will be provided when developed
John Williams	Planning		You should publish your goals and metrics. For example how healthy can a forest be if it is X acres large and is too small to support the full range of wildlife that it evolved with?	Overall goals and metrics for the program are described in the policy and implementation plan. Additional detail on restoration objectives and metrics will be included in project plans
Marion Allen	Planning	Funding	When and where Raydiant will be logging- although I realize they can give short notice. Would like to see cost estimates for projects.	Private logging operations are outside of the scope of this document. Cost estimates are included in project plans
Philip Sutherland	Planning	Techniques	After reviewing some of the plans and presentations on the county website, it is still unclear to me: 1) Approximately how many trees would be removed from Banner Forest, 2) What the criteria for removing those trees would be, 3) Who will be paid for performing this work and 4) What equipment and methods will be used	Prescription information including restoration objectives and techniques will be determined and included in project plans
Bernadette Henzi	Planning	Funding	What is the actual goal of forest restoration in Banner Forest? What will happen to the income from the sale of the trees?	The goal of the forest stewardship and restoration program is to ensure the long-term health and viability of the forest. Income from the sale of any timber products helps support the restoration program including professional staff to support the natural resource program, invasive species management, and other restoration actions.
Kathleen Simpson	Planning		Interested in forestry plan	The current plans are available online. Additional plans will be added as they become available
Judy Arbogast	Planning	Funding	Overall goal; specific plans for work required [including costs/cost effectiveness; types of equipment, access for equipment]; information on wildlife protection; information on fire wise practices [Yes, it IS a problem in Western WA]; recreation benefits and harm; scientific information on pros/cons; impacts on wetland areas in the forest; why now?; how does this fit with county priorities for recreation, other priorities; what is the problem to be solved - is there a problem or a promise of money to be gained???	These issues are addressed in the policy and implementation plan document. Additional detail will be provided in subsequent planning documents.

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Bryan Inglin	Policy		What is the grand vision for all the parks? Older forest condition?	The overall goals for the program are outlined in the policy document
Mike Collins	Natural Resources	Invasive Species	How you intend to mitigate the scotch broom and black berries like that which invaded and took over Coulter Creek and Newberry Hill?	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Megan Thompson	Natural Resources	Invasive Species	I went to the site talk at Banner in July. I heard several comments about Scotch Broom and blackberries taking over Newbury Hill and Coulter Creek after their thinning, but didn't hear how that is expected to be curtailed at Banner.	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Carol Price	Natural Resources		Residents need to participate in park planning, including forest planning. Did not answer the question directly above, since Kitsap Parks by their very nature are assaulted by continuous disruption, most particularly PGFHP---there is no easy answer between "all at once" or "small projects". I would vote for very thoughtful and minimal "treatments" Discuss the costs to habitat, wildlife, and ecology, and not project cost\$. Will recovery from the treatment actually result in restoration?	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Leah Farrell	Planning		More information about options. Long term plans with Banner Forest beyond restoration	Additional planning for Banner Forest will be provided when developed
Kristine Goss	Planning		Full transparency regarding logging and profit and ecosystem destruction.	Additional planning for Banner Forest will be provided when developed
Rebecca Sliger	Planning	Communication	Updates as projects are happening. Emails and signs in park are helpful. It would help to have this information in community newspapers as well, before they are happening, not reporting that they have happened.	Parks dept will explore additional ways to disseminate information
Craig Richmond	Education	Invasive Species	Our community needs a lot of education about forest management. There's a group of people pleading to leave Banner a "wild forest", which is silly considering it's commercially planted and an even-age stand. Helping clarify the noxious weed and invasive species control plans should help with some of those concerns.	Webpage redesign will include additional educational resources and links to references
Lisa Reddish	County Management		How you will protect the security of visitors and eliminate crime and homeless encampments.	This is beyond the scope of this program but will pass this on to staff
Doug Hayman	Financials		It would be helpful to be informed about the decision matrix you all use to leave a high dollar value tree in the park versus when you are money-driven and have to bring in X dollars so you make choices that some would prefer not have happened.	The development of larger trees in our parks is a primary goal of the program. Trees will only be removed if it is necessary to meet ecological objectives.

Feedback Form Comment Response Matrix

Carly Sullivan	Education	Background	I would love to see any scientific studies relevant to the choices being made re: changes to the park and how it will help. Any details to understand the plan would be great :)	Webpage redesign will include additional educational resources and links to references. References and studies used to guide the program are in the Reference section of the Policy document.
Deborah Weinmann	Project Timelines		Annual timeline highlighting projects for the upcoming year and their prioritization. Publish and send annually via email. Thank you!	Project timelines will be published as they become available
Katherine Ander	Education		Please talk about the cost to forest health from not thinning or managing woodlands. You may want to connect public with volunteer forest stewards who can show areas of the park that have been thinned & are thriving. One of the Banner Park public complaints was that Coulter Creek is overrun with Scotch Broom after thinning. This is not accurate. Let park volunteers help with messaging!	Webpage redesign will include additional educational resources and links to references. Additional site walks will be performed as capacity allows
April Ryan	References		Is the Forest Restoration and Stewardship Program informed by modern science and expert knowledge? If so, please provide references so that the primary stakeholders, the public, can be reassured that "Restoration" and "Stewardship" are not merely program titles.	References are listed in the policy document
Bobby Lauterjung	Natural Resources		More accountability and transparency - concerned about the amount of acreage being thinned in such a short window. What is the plan for wildlife preservation and support with habitats being disrupted. Low confidence in ability to prevent invasive vegetation based on current countywide control of plants like scotch broom haven't	Additional assessment and planning for resource protection including wetland protection, wildlife protection, and invasive species management will occur at the more detailed planning phases including the park plan and project plans.
Janet Wyatt	Other		Accessibility, not just the main trails. For disabilities using walkers, scooters, wheelchair. Port a potties for handicap at all the parks. Updated maps showing the accessibility. When I went to your website there was no confirmation on the map showing access	Recreation and trail management is outside the scope of this program, but we will pass this information along to staff