

Chapter 5. Comments and Responses

This Chapter presents the letters of comment and public hearing testimony received during the 60-day comment period for the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update Volumes I, II, and III as required by the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). On August 29, 2006, Kitsap County released Volume I: Draft Comprehensive Plan Policy Document, Volume II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Volume III: Proposed Regulations for the 10-Year Update. The period to provide written comments extended from August 29, 2006 to 4:30 p.m. October 30, 2006. Public hearings were held on September 18, 20, and 21 and October 23, 2006, with a continuation to October 25, 2006. Comments received prior to this 60-day comment period are included in the record before the Board of County Commissioners, but are not provided responses in this document.

Comment letters and testimony were received from special district and government agencies, as well as interest groups and local citizens. Actual comment letters are located on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment. The comment letters are divided by the following categories:

- 5.1 Government Agencies, Tribes, Special Districts, and Utilities
- 5.2 Citizens Businesses and Property Owners by location of North, Central and South Kitsap
- 5.3 Interest Groups
- 5.4 Draft Public Hearing Comments

Distinct comments are numbered in the margins of the written testimony with responses corresponding to the numbered comment. Comments that state an opinion or preference are acknowledged with a response that indicates the comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Comments that ask questions, request clarifications or corrections, or are related to the Draft Plan, DEIS, and Draft Regulations are provided a response which explains the approach, offers corrections, or provides other appropriate replies.

Letters received after 4:30 p.m. October 30, 2006 are not included in the FEIS Comments and Responses. In addition responses to comments regarding Port Orchard/South Kitsap Integrated Draft Sub-Area Plan and DEIS are included in FEIS Appendix F; this appendix is referenced as appropriate since the 10-Year Update incorporated the goals, policies, and the vast majority of land use recommendations of the Sub-Area Plan and since the 10-Year Update FEIS completes the Port Orchard/South Kitsap environmental review process as well.

5.1. Government Agencies, Tribes, Special Districts, and Utilities

Table 5.1-1 lists city, special district, utility, tribal and state agencies that prepared comments addressing the 10-Year Update. The agency letters appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment.

Table 5.1-1. Agency Letters

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
1	McConnell, Cecil	Bremerton, City of	10/23/2006
2	Attebery, Ken	Bremerton, Port of	9/21/2006
3	Attebery, Ken	Bremerton, Port of	9/22/2006
4	Attebery, Ken	Bremerton, Port of	9/22/2006
5	Attebery, Ken	Bremerton, Port of	9/23/2006
6	Sheeran, Dennis et al.	Illahee, Port of	10/30/2006
7	Unnamed	North Perry Avenue Water District	9/14/2006
8	Streissguth, Linda	Puget Sound Energy	9/25/2006
9	O'Sullivan, Alison	Suquamish Tribe	10/30/2006
10	Gates, Tim	Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development	10/20/2006
11	Davis, Jeff	Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife	10/30/2006
12	Washington, Tom	Washington State Department of Transportation	10/26/2006
13	Bergstrom, Arno W.	Washington State University, Kitsap County Extension	9/21/2006

Letter No. 1 City of Bremerton

Response to Comment 1: Commend Effort to Complete Plan by 2006

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Additional Comments after July 10, 2006

The comment is noted. Responses to the July 10, 2006 comments attached to the October 19, 2006 letter are addressed below.

Response to Comment 3: Non-Association of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs)

The County's intent to pursue Urban Growth Area Management Agreements (UGAMAs) is stated in Section 2.2.4 of the Land Use Element, and UGA association is given a high priority in Chapter 18, Implementation. In response to the comment, and in addition to similar policies found under Goals 8 and 10 of the Land Use Element, a policy has been added under Goal 8 stating: "Include UGAMA negotiations for Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton as a work plan item for the 2007-2008 budget period, dedicating staff time to their resolution."

Response to Comment 4: Draft Proposal for Bremerton UGA Associations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 3 above.

Response to Comment 5: Central Kitsap UGA

Regarding UGA association, please see Response to Comment 3.

The comments in support of the general direction of Alternative 2 and mixed uses are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see the description of the Preferred Alternative in Chapter 2. The Preferred Alternative continues to include mixed use classifications along SR-303.

The comments in support of population banking and potential future allocations are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative Land Use Element continues to include policies addressing population banking and inter-jurisdictional coordination.

The comments identifying preferences regarding the amount and location of Urban Restricted designations are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Urban Restricted designations are based on locations of high rank order critical areas such as streams, wetlands, and geologically hazardous areas, and in some instances based upon critical aquifer recharge area concerns. It is expected that the locations of the Urban Restricted designation can be reviewed during the UGAMA process. Please see Response to Comment 3.

The comments regarding opposition to a Central Valley extension, and opposition to a Brownsville extension inside a UGA, are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 6: Gorst and ULID#6 UGAs

The comments regarding association of the Gorst UGA and pending utility extensions are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Policies under Goal 8 of the Land Use Element address conducting UGAMAs for all unassociated UGAs.

The association of the ULID#6 UGA to neighboring cities is addressed in Land Use Element Section 2.2.4, which states in part: “The ULID #6/McCormick UGA is currently unassociated with two abutting incorporated jurisdictions, the cities of Bremerton and Port Orchard. With sewer service provided by City of Port Orchard and water by both Bremerton and Port Orchard, association discussions will have to specifically include agreements about the future of these and other urban services. Additionally, with the close proximity of this UGA to the Port Orchard/South Kitsap, SKIA and Gorst UGAs, association will require enhanced coordination to ensure the logical annexations throughout the south end.” Policies under Goal 8 of the Land Use Element address conducting UGAMAs for all unassociated UGAs.

Response to Comment 7: East and West Bremerton UGAs

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Land uses proposed in East and West Bremerton are intended to identify focused areas where additional growth in mixed use or higher densities may occur. However, it is expected that additional discussions regarding land uses and population banking would occur through the UGAMA process. Please see Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 8: Consider Effects of Land Use Choices on Bremerton

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Responses to Comments 1 through 7 above.

Response to Comment 9: Associate Central Kitsap UGA

Regarding UGA association, please see Response to Comment 3 above. Regarding services, the DEIS (Volume II) identified service needs for a 20-year period and the Volume I Capital Facilities Plan identified specific projects and funding sources to meet demand for the required 6-year period. Further, the Land Use Element promotes use of alternative wastewater technologies that allow for urban growth. It is expected that service delivery will be a topic in future UGAMAs.

Response to Comment 10: Modified Alternative 2

Please see Response to Comment 5. Please note that the Preferred Alternative continues to include the Barker Creek Corridor as a “rural corridor” similar to Alternative 2.

Response to Comment 11: Modifications to Central Kitsap UGA in Alternative 2

The BOCC has selected an amended version of Alternative 2 as its Preferred Alternative. Please see FEIS Chapter 2.

Regarding North Perry Avenue, mixed use is proposed in selected areas to help concentrate growth along an area with road and utility access. However, north of Sylvan Way, the extent of the Mixed Use designations has been reduced in the Preferred Alternative given a wetland complex, and is instead identified as Urban Restricted.

In some locations multifamily designations are proposed along major roads away from commercial areas to assist in providing reasonable measures to achieve population targets and to

provide for housing variety. Land use patterns can be further reviewed through the UGAMA process. See Response to Comment 3.

In terms of allowable uses in the Mixed Use Zone, Volume III provides the proposed code text. A draft of Volume III was made available on August 29, 2006 at the time the Volume I Draft Plan and Volume II DEIS were made available.

In addition to the Mixed Use Zone, the County proposes several reasonable measures to help achieve planned densities. Please see Land Use Element Section 2.2.3, DEIS Appendix H, and FEIS Appendix C. Please also see Response to Comment 5.

Response to Comment 12: East Bremerton UGA

Please see Response to Comment 7.

Response to Comment 13: West Bremerton UGA

Preferred Alternative land use designations in West Bremerton are consistent with Alternative 2 and show a mix of uses along National Avenue and both low density and higher density categories elsewhere. The mixed use and higher density categories are part of reasonable measures to help meet the population allocation. It is expected that additional discussions regarding land uses and population banking would occur through the UGAMA process. Please see Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 14: South Kitsap Industrial Area

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Plan indicates the following regarding future UGA association in the Land Use Element Section 2.2.4: “The UGA currently abuts the City of Bremerton’s watershed area, and the Port of Bremerton has executed an interlocal agreement with the City of Port Orchard for sewer and other services. Both the cities of Bremerton and Port Orchard provide water service. Association of the UGA must include these jurisdictions with discussions of economic development goals, revenue sharing, and annexation.”

In DEIS Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative, property under consideration for a speedway is shown as an Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA) to accommodate emerging economic development opportunities. Located within the SKIA UGA, this area will be an urban holding designation and may only be developed at urban levels after further public process and approvals. This future process would include public hearings before the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) on a development agreement, master plan, project level environmental review, and detailed capital facility plans. This allows the development proponents to bear the cost of project-specific environmental and capital planning analysis. The policies also include a sunset clause to reverse the UGA expansion if the requirements are not met.

The DEIS analysis in Section 3.2.2 indicated that the concept of a holding designation inside a UGA is included in the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) list of reasonable

measures (see DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C), and has been upheld in cases in the Western Washington GMHB (for example, Case No. 95-2-0067).

Response to Comment 15: Gorst UGA

Proposed land uses in the Gorst area are related to a land use reclassification request as well as the need to provide capacity for a population target. The Preferred Alternative boundaries are in-between those of Alternatives 2 and 3. Please also see Response to Comment 6.

Response to Comment 16: Port Orchard Expansions

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Port Orchard Citizen Advisory Group examined how best to accommodate projected growth and sizing of the urban area boundary based upon the provisions of the GMA, while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Citizen Advisory Group was the result of mapping exercises conducted at a Citizen Advisory Group meeting on April 27, 2005 and analyzed and voted upon in subsequent meetings held on May 18, June 9, and July 6, 2005. The Citizen Advisory Group recommended a Preferred Alternative on June 9, 2005 and the Land Use Alternatives in the Draft Sub-Area Plan and Draft 10-Year Update were a result of that community consensus process. Kitsap County Department of Community Staff and professional consultants provided technical assistance when requested. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Please also see FEIS Chapter 2 for maps of the Preferred Alternative, which does alter the Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA boundaries along Baby Doll Road and Mile Hill Drive.

Response to Comment 17: Land Use Designation Differences with Bremerton

As the governing body of unincorporated areas, Kitsap County has an obligation to plan for unincorporated UGAs and to try to meet population allocation goals set by the cities and the County through the KRCC, as well as to respond to citizen input through the 10-Year Update. The County proposals for land uses in Alternative 2 are compatible with Countywide Planning Policies (see DEIS Appendix I). The Preferred Alternative is similar to Alternative 2 with more alignment to City wishes in Central Kitsap, such as in the area north of Waaga Way and Perry Avenue at Sylvan Way. The UGAMA process is intended to address land uses and service delivery in more detail. Please see Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 18: Multi-family Designation Location

In some locations, multifamily designations are proposed along major roads where utilities are available or could be made available. Although these are located away from commercial areas, they assist in providing reasonable measures to achieve population targets and to provide for housing variety. Land use patterns can be further reviewed through the UGAMA process. See Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 19: Commercial Expansions along Roadways

In Central Kitsap, the Preferred Alternative promotes mixed uses and has a lesser extent of Highway Tourist Commercial categories than Alternative 1. In Port Orchard, the Preferred Alternative converts the previously proposed Highway Tourist Commercial considered in Alternative 2 along the Bethel Corridor UGA expansion to Mixed Use. Also, the Neighborhood Commercial designation considered for Mile Hill in Alternative 2 is removed in the Preferred Alternative. Further, in all of the UGA commercial classifications, greater density ranges are proposed, and reasonable measures are considered such as listed in Land Use Element Section 2.2.3.

Response to Comment 20: Managing Growth

Please see Responses to Comments 18 and 19. The Preferred Alternative provides several measures to respond to the growth planned in Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) including greater mixed use areas in centers and along corridors where single-use commercial has previously been established, policies and regulations to require urban level sewer service, greater densities near corridors or other main roadways to provide for efficient land uses/housing variety, and help achieve reasonable measures, etc. The County intends to work with cities on UGAMAs to finalize land use, public services, and other issues of mutual concern.

Response to Comment 21: Commit to Cooperation

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 2 Port of Bremerton (9/21/06; Attebery, Ken)

Response to Comment 1: Change SEPA Lead Agency Policies

Policies SKIA-12 and 13 (subsection 15) included in the Draft Plan are deleted in the Preferred Alternative to reestablish the Port of Bremerton as the lead agency under SEPA.

Letter No. 3 Port of Bremerton (9/22/06; Attebery, Ken)

Response to Comment 1: Add Transportation Policies to SKIA Sub-Area Plan

The Preferred Alternative includes two additional policies in the SKIA Sub-Area Plan Chapter similar to those requested in the comment.

Letter No. 4 Port of Bremerton (9/22/06; Attebery, Ken)

Response to Comment 1: Actionable Ideas Removed from Economic Development Element

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Comment 2 below regarding policies reinstated in the Economic Development Element.

Response to Comment 2: Retain Specific Economic Development Goals and Policies from 1998 Plan

The Preferred Alternative includes four additional policies in the proposed Economic Development Element including 1998 Plan policies ED-5, -7, -9, and -11.

Letter No. 5 Port of Bremerton (9/23/06; Attebery, Ken)

Response to Comment 1: Code Regarding Heights near Airports

Draft Volume III moved section 17.375.090 to be a note on the density and dimensions table applicable to the Airport Zone (Volume II DEIS, pages 3-9 and 3-15). The moved text was identical to the regulations in effect prior to the 10-Year Update. The ability to limit heights is retained in the Preferred Alternative in the proposed regulation ordinances.

Letter No. 6 Port of Illahee

Response to Comment 1: Appropriate Zoning for the Illahee Community

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap and East Bremerton UGAs represents a significant amount of the Illahee Citizens Advisory Group desires. It is also expected that future zoning of this area, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29, as well as Volume I; Chapter 17: Community and Neighborhood Plans.

Response to Comment 2: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does include the Fir Drive area as Urban Restricted (1-5 du/ac). It is also expected that future zoning of this area, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I, Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Response to Comment 3: Sunset & East Boulevard Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does include the Sunset and East Boulevard zoning from Urban Low, as presented in Alternative 2, to Urban Restricted residential (1-5 du/acre).

Response to Comment 4: Rolling Hills Golf Course Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does include the Rolling Hills Golf Course as Urban Reserve (1 du/ 10 acres). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of

Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I, Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Letter No. 7 North Perry Avenue Water District

Response to Comment 1: CFP – Water System Plan Updates Every 6 Years

The comment is noted. Please see the proposed revised CFP (Preferred Alternative Volume I, Appendix A) that corrects the reference to required updates being every 6 years not every 5 years. Corresponding changes are made to similar sections in the DEIS. See FEIS Chapter 4.

Response to Comment 2: CFP – Minor District Service Area Text Revisions

The comment is noted. Please see the proposed revised CFP (Preferred Alternative Volume I, Appendix A) that revises the service area district text as requested. Corresponding changes are made to similar sections in the DEIS. See FEIS Chapter 4.

Response to Comment 3: CFP – Clarify Population Projection Approach

The comment is noted. Please see the proposed revised CFP (Preferred Alternative Volume I, Appendix A) that revises the sentence regarding population projection methods.

Response to Comment 4: CFP – North Perry Existing Connections

The comment is noted. Please see the proposed revised CFP (Preferred Alternative Volume I, Appendix A) that revises the sentence regarding existing connections for North Perry. Corresponding changes are made to a similar table in the DEIS. See FEIS Chapter 4.

Response to Comment 5: CFP – Grant Source

The comment is noted. Please see the proposed revised CFP (Preferred Alternative Volume I, Appendix A) that revises the sentence to correct the agency providing the grant for the reservoir project.

Letter No. 8 Puget Sound Energy

Response to Comment 1: Policy Regarding GIS Data Collection

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Policy promotes collection of data regarding facility locations and capacities for natural gas, electric, and telecommunications service providers to promote coordinated planning. Please note that the Preferred Alternative retains the policy since it is general and does not require agencies to provide data that is restricted from publication due to homeland security concerns.

Response to Comment 2: Inventory for All of Kitsap County

The comment is noted. Please see the correction in FEIS Chapter 4.

Letter No. 9 The Suquamish Tribe

Response to Comment 1: Avoid Impacts to Natural Resources

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Plan Policies and EIS mitigation measures are intended to reduce impacts of growth in unincorporated Kitsap County.

Response to Comment 2: Reasonable Measures

Please see DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C for an evaluation of existing reasonable measures and recommended additional reasonable measures.

Response to Comment 3: Urban Low & Urban Cluster Residential

Citizen groups, such as those in Silverdale and Central Kitsap, have lobbied for residential densities lower than 5 dwelling units per acre to maintain neighborhood character – as low as 3 dwelling units per acre. In *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995, the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) found that, as a general rule, 4 dwelling units per acre or more constitutes urban densities for Kitsap County. Four dwelling units per acre addresses GMA requirements specific to Kitsap County and these community desires. Please also note that four dwelling units per acre is consistent with the cities of Port Orchard, Bainbridge Island and Poulsbo, which have minimum densities of 4 - 4.5 du/ac.

The use of the minimum density is a conservative estimate and is also the minimum density that the County can require. While preliminary results for the 2000-2005 period are showing a positive trend in Urban Low Residential plats, the results are not universally found in all UGAs. The County is planning for the minimum urban density it can require but is also providing for more housing densities and choices than the 1998 Plan.

Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative maintain a wide density range of 4-9 du/ac for the Urban Low and Urban Cluster classification which will provide flexibility to ensure that developments are marketable and able to spread costs of urban services. In addition, Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative provide for greater housing diversity having greater percentage of multifamily unit capacity than other alternatives (22% in Alternative 2 and 25% in the Preferred Alternative versus 13% for Alternatives 1 and 3). Higher density residential zones/mixed use zones would allow up to 30 du/ac in some locations rather than the current maximum of 24 du/ac.

Minimum densities would be established for residential development within all Urban zones, and future countywide densities would be expected to meet CPSGMHB urban density requirements for Kitsap County.

Response to Comment 4: Urban Industrial and Business Lands

Please see Volume II DEIS, pages 3.2-152 and 3.2-153, regarding the IMPRA designation. These pages indicate that the employment acre demand model is intended for typical employment uses of employees in buildings, and not for unique uses. Therefore the employment demand when known for the IMPRA would be added to the Countywide Employment Targets.

“In the SKIA area where the IMPRA is proposed, the assumptions for the capacity analysis assume current, Alternative 1 zoning, which is Business Center and Industrial and Rural Residential in part. If the IMPRA were instituted in the Comprehensive Plan, no development could occur until a master plan and development agreement are prepared which will result in new implementing zones (a subsequent legislative action that would require additional public review). At the time of a master plan, the number of jobs would be forecast which may be similar or different than current assumptions (based on Business Center/Industrial zoning for the properties currently in the UGA). Since the IMPRA is proposed to accommodate a unique use(s) not accounted for in present employment forecasts or employment land demand, its employment, when determined, would be added to the Countywide year 2025 job forecast (Table 3.2-75). The employment land demand forecasting translates typical employment sector jobs into building area and ultimately land area. Unique uses, such as mineral operations, colleges, and recreational facilities (such as a speedway, golf course, etc.) are not included in the employment land demand forecasting as they do not involve buildings in the traditional manner. Therefore, unique uses in the IMPRA would add to the employment land demand analysis and not subtract from it.” (Volume II, DEIS pages 3.2-152 and 3.2-153)

Please also see Response to Letter No. 1, Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 5: Open Space and Greenways

Please see Response to Comment 18 below.

Response to Comment 6: Historic Preservation

Regulations to address cultural resource protection would be implemented pursuant to policies included in Land Use Element Section 2.2.10.

Response to Comment 7: Add Suquamish Tribe to Certain Policies

The comments are noted. The Preferred Alternative adds a reference to coordinating with local tribes in cultural resource protection in several policies.

Response to Comment 8: Additional Urban Separators

The Preferred Alternative includes Barker Creek as a rural corridor between the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs. Additional designation of urban separators is not proposed at this time. However, Natural Systems Element policies and critical area regulations will continue to apply.

Response to Comment 9: Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRDS)

As noted in Policy RL-21, the County intends to “[i]dentify and designate LAMIRDS in the rural area, consistent with the requirements of the GMA.”

Response to Comment 10: LAMIRDs and Infill Development

Please see Response to Comment 9. In addition, the County follows the direction of CPSGMHB cases such as *1000 Friends of Washington, v. Kitsap County*, CPSGMHB Case No. 04-3-0031c, which indicated appropriate methods to identify logical outer boundaries and allow for infill.

Response to Comment 11: Rural Wooded Policies

Draft Volume I Appendix C policies regarding the Rural Wooded Incentive Program (RWIP) have been integrated into Section 3.2.7 of the Preferred Alternative Rural and Resource Lands Element. Those policies include considerations such as promote “an interconnected system of open space in the rural areas.” In addition, the policies promote monitoring and evaluation of the program, such as: “Implement a system to monitor the effectiveness of the Rural Wooded Incentive program, and the compatibility and impacts of land uses in Rural Wooded zone, in cooperation with landowners, stakeholders and others. Monitoring will be conducted on a bi-annual basis and presented in a report to the Board of County Commissioners.” Please also note that the RWIP is a pilot program for 5,000 acres of Rural Wooded lands and upon further review and monitoring, course corrections may be made before the program is potentially extended.

Response to Comment 12: Policy and Code Consistency on Permanent Protection

The comments are noted. Draft policies RL-63, -65 and -67 (note policies are renumbered under Goal 15 in the Final Plan) have been modified in the Preferred Alternative to remove the words “permanent” or “permanently”.

Response to Comment 13: Surface Water Resources

Policies are general guiding statements. Implementing programs and regulations would provide detail and the steps needed to create a successful program. Case studies of past wetland banks in and outside of Kitsap County can help provide direction for any new efforts to provide for wetland banks. The comments on future urban separators are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 14: Plant, Fish, and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The DEIS addressed the “Kitsap Salmonid Refugia Report (May et al. 2003)” in Section 3.1.

Response to Comment 15: Water Quality

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the County will be addressing a Shoreline Master Program Update by the state deadline of 2011.

Response to Comment 16: Economic Development

Please see Response to Comment 15.

Response to Comment 17: Natural Systems

Please see Response to Comment 15.

Response to Comment 18: Chapter 10 Parks, Recreation and Open Space

Reference to the Greenways Plan is added to Policies POS-8 and POS-32 in the Preferred Alternative Chapter 10. The Bicycle Facilities Plan is referenced in Transportation Chapter policies, along with other trail plans.

Response to Comment 19: Basin-Wide Approach

The DEIS provides a programmatic analysis of potential impacts to natural systems in Section 3.1. It estimates the increase in impervious surfaces by major watersheds. See DEIS Tables 3.1-8 and 3.1-9. This programmatic approach is appropriate to the study of nonproject actions such as a comprehensive plan.

The DEIS does not assert that critical areas regulations, the Shoreline Master Program, or stormwater regulations can fully mitigate impacts. The DEIS indicates on page 3.1-72: “Two mechanisms that have significant influence on natural surface water systems, forest removal and creation of impervious surfaces (Booth et al. 2002), would unavoidably accompany the increased development. These impacts would be mitigated to some extent through programmatic land use/zoning, implementation of planning policies in the Comprehensive Plan, implementation of County codes, and implementation of project-specific BMPs. However, full mitigation of all impacts on surface water and groundwater resources is not feasible. Where development occurs in areas that are not now fully urbanized and are more heavily vegetated, there could be localized impacts because engineered surface water systems may not be 100% effective in replicating natural systems.”

The Plan and DEIS include policies and mitigation measures to promote implementation of all adopted watershed and salmon recovery plans, new stormwater regulations, etc., to help minimize impacts.

Response to Comment 20: Stormwater Impacts from Impervious Surfaces

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The DEIS addresses the potential impacts related to impervious surfaces noting appropriate studies. Please also see Response to Comment 19.

Response to Comment 21: Table 1.4-1 of DEIS

Volume II, DEIS Table 1.4-1, compares and contrasts the three DEIS Alternatives. Alternative 2 comes closest to Countywide Planning Policies growth targets, and the Preferred Alternative is similarly close to targets. See Responses to Comments 2, 3, 4, 8, 18, 19 and 20 regarding densities, urban separators, greenways, reasonable measures, IMPRA, and watershed analysis.

Response to Comment 22: Cultural Resources and Inadvertent Discovery

Please see Responses to Comment 6 and 30.

Response to Comment 23: Stormwater Standards

The DEIS offers potential mitigation measures to be considered by decision-makers. Policies provide more direction as to which efforts the County intends to pursue. See Land Use Element policies in Section 2.2.11 that promote low impact development (Goal 33 and associated policies for example). Policies also promote application of updated stormwater standards stating in part: “[i]mplement development regulations to control stormwater runoff that meet or exceed the state’s minimum stormwater technical requirements.”

Response to Comment 24: Phased Review

Phased review indicates that the EIS prepared for the Comprehensive Plan Update on a programmatic level is appropriate for the nonproject action under consideration by the County. Future area or site-specific projects would require more specific review consistent with SEPA regulations. Further, the EIS focuses on cumulative impacts given the countywide nature of the planning effort for unincorporated lands. Critical area mapping is included in Section 3.1 of the DEIS, and was considered in the impact analysis. On the basis of the analysis and citizen comment, areas of high rank order were sometimes excluded from the UGA (Barker Creek, Central Kitsap north of Waaga Way, and northeast Port Orchard), or addressed at Urban Restricted densities (Clear Creek in Silverdale, and other locations in Silverdale and Central Kitsap). Please refer to Response to Comments 19 and 20.

Response to Comment 25: Table 2.6-10 of DEIS

No policy changes are proposed in the Shorelines Element. The County intends to address its Shoreline Master Program by 2011.

Response to Comment 26: SEPA Categorical Exemptions

Categorical exemptions are allowed in SEPA, and pursuant to SEPA the exemptions would not apply on lands covered by water. The County has not selected the maximum exemptions possible at this time. Comments on future development applications are still possible through the notice of application process. Further, the County code provides regulations that are intended to reduce impacts. See DEIS Appendix F.

Response to Comment 27: Shoreline Master Program

Please see Chapter 4 of this FEIS. Reference is made to the pending update of the Shoreline Master Program.

Response to Comment 28: Water Resources

The highly urbanized nature of the Sinclair Inlet is noted in the DEIS text on page 3.1-28. Correction to salmonid names is provided in Chapter 4 of the FEIS. Reference to the new juvenile salmon use study is also provided in Chapter 4 of the FEIS.

Response to Comment 29: Cultural Resources Treaty Text

The suggested text providing more details about treaty rights is added to the DEIS in Chapter 4 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 30: Preservation and Existing Programs

Text regarding inadvertent discovery is proposed to be added to “Other Potential Mitigation Measures” in the Cultural Resources Section. Please also see Response to Comment 6 and FEIS Chapter 4.

Response to Comment 31: National Level

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 32: Applicable Regulations and Commitments

The intent of Applicable Regulations and Commitments is to identify measures or programs “on the books.” “Other Potential Mitigation Measures” identify additional actions the County can take. Greater coordination with the Tribe is identified in Other Potential Mitigation Measures related to Cultural Resources. Also see Responses to Comments 6 and 30 and FEIS Chapter 4.

Response to Comment 33: RWIP–Overall

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Letter No. 10, Response to Comment 19.

Response to Comment 34: RWIP Monitoring–Urban/Rural Split

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Letter No. 10, Response to Comment 19.

Response to Comment 35: RWIP Monitoring–Release of Additional Properties

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 36: Timeframe for Wooded Reserve

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 37: Rural Wooded Lot Sizes

Comments on the minimum lot size for the RWIP are noted. Analysis of the program application, in conjunction with the comments from the stakeholder group provided the information that application of this program would be highly dependent upon a site by site physical analysis and review of the most appropriate measures to ensure the maintenance of rural character and critical areas while allowing the maximum flexibility for the development. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 38: Hazard Trees

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 39: Water Availability

The comments regarding water availability have been acknowledged. The review and application of new wells does fall under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Ecology and it is anticipated that the state agency would be the lead source of additional regulation regarding these items.

Response to Comment 40: Wooded Reserve

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 41: Forest Management Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 42: Roads

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 43: Vesting

The comments regarding the vesting of developments within the RWIP are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note the RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 44: Transfer of Development Right Program-Overall Comments

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 45: Urban Growth Areas

Please see Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 46: Urban Restricted

The comment references “rural restricted” within UGAs. We assume the comment refers to “Urban Restricted” as that is the lower density category allowed in UGAs for the purposes of greater critical area protection. The comments in support of Urban Restricted designations are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 47: Central Kitsap UGA, Support Barker Creek Corridor

Support for the UGA contract and establishment of a rural corridor for Barker Creek is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 48: Urban Densities

Please see Response to Comments 2 and 3 above. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1, Comment 20, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 49: Kingston

The issue of water availability is addressed in DEIS Section 3.3.9 based on the consolidated water plans. A description of each water district is provided. Also see the 6-year Capital Facilities Plan that addresses all public service providers in the County.

Response to Comment 50: Port Orchard UGA

Please see Response to Letter No. 1, Comment 16, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 10 Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

Response to Comment 1: Commend Public Process and Time Investment

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Improved Presentation of Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: UGA Expansions Primarily for Urban Low Residential

Alternative 2 does increase the amount of land devoted to single-family uses. The countywide Alternative 2 Urban Low Residential acres represent an increase of 1.5% above Alternative 1 in Table 3.2-34. Within UGAs, Alternative 2 Urban Low Residential acres represent 68% of total UGA residential acres (Table 3.2-36) whereas Alternative 1 contains 69% Urban Low Residential acres. The Preferred Alternative share of Urban Low acres is approximately 67% (see Chapter 3 of this FEIS).

Although the Urban Low Residential classification remains a significant component of UGAs, Alternative 2 maintains a wide single-family density range of 4-9 du/ac in this classification. In addition Alternative 2 provides for greater housing diversity having greater percentage of multifamily unit capacity than other DEIS alternatives (22% in Alternative 2 versus 13% for Alternatives 1 and 3). The Preferred Alternative provides for 25% of new dwellings to be multifamily, the highest of all studied alternatives. The minimum density of 4 du/ac is a density that is considered urban for Kitsap County by the CPSGMHB in *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995.

Response to Comment 4: Reasonable Measures

The comment that Policies LU-8 to LU-11 are consistent with RCW 36.70A.215 and Countywide Planning Policies is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Draft Policy LU-31 (numbered LU-32 in the Final Plan) guides zoning and density review of the land use plan, and the policy is consistent with the evaluation direction in Policies LU-8 to LU-11. Policy LU-32 will be considered with all relevant policies when the County makes decisions to amend land use plans in the future.

Response to Comment 5: Encouraging Focused Urban Growth Patterns within UGAs

The comment that Policies LU-20 to LU-23 clearly state the aim to have an efficient, compact urban development distinct from rural areas is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Population Allocation Banking and UGA Association

The cited policies are related to population allocation banking and intergovernmental cooperation. The Department's comments that they represent a reasonable direction are noted and forwarded

to appropriate decision-makers. These policies are renumbered in the Final Plan but still appear under Goals 8 and 9 of the Land Use Chapter.

Response to Comment 7: Consolidating Land Use Map Categories

The comment regarding the consolidated land use map categories (see renumbered LU-37) being an important measure to help the County meet its vision and redirect growth to urban areas is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 8: Policies Requiring Urban Level Sewage Treatment

Support for policies LU-14 to 16 allowing alternative sewer treatment is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 9: Minimum Density Requirements

Support for minimum density requirements is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. (See renumbered LU-43.)

Response to Comment 10: Reducing Minimum Densities in Urban Low/Urban Cluster Residential Zones

Please see Response to Comment 3 under the Suquamish Tribe, Letter No. 9, regarding densities. Please also note that four dwelling units per acre is consistent with the cities of Port Orchard, Bainbridge Island, and Poulsbo, which have minimum densities of 4 - 4.5 du/ac.

Response to Comment 11: Updates to Urban Medium and High Residential Zones

Support for policies regarding heights and densities in Urban Medium and High Residential classifications is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Regarding consistency with municipal plans, the County is striving for inter-jurisdictional consistency by ensuring compliance with the Countywide Planning Policies. DEIS page 3.2-80 describes the measurement of consistency: "As required by the GMA and Kitsap County CPPs, the County and cities' comprehensive plans must be consistent with each other. WAC 365-195-520 describes inter-jurisdictional consistency and states '[a]dopted Countywide planning policies are designed to ensure that city and county comprehensive plans are consistent. Each local comprehensive plan should demonstrate that such policies have been followed in its development.'"

The County has also solicited and considered citizen comments in these unincorporated areas to guide planning in UGAs.

The County is responsible for planning in unincorporated areas and for UGA expansions until the area is annexed or until UGAMAs, such as in Poulsbo, are in place. Until such agreements are completed, UGAs not already assigned to Bremerton or other cities (e.g. Central, Gorst, SKIA, ULID#6) would be planned consistent with County plans.

Response to Comment 12: New Mixed Use Zone

Support for the new Mixed Use zone is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Mixed use policies are carried forward under Goal 17 of the Final Plan Land Use Chapter. Additionally, several policies (LU-28 for example) promote UGAMAs to ensure that land uses and services are compatible between jurisdictions.

Response to Comment 13: Policies for Highway-Oriented Commercial

The comments are noted. The Preferred Alternative deletes Draft Policy LU-74.

Response to Comment 14: IMPRA

The comments regarding the IMPRA approach being cautious given the master plan, SEPA, and capital facility requirements are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 15: Low Impact Development

Support for low impact development policies is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 16: Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

Support for a TDR program is noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Cascade Land Conservancy comments are considered in responses to comments. See Section 5.3 Interest Groups.

Response to Comment 17: Urban Reserve

Pre-planning was allowed in urban areas, and its removal would mean this allowance would no longer be available. Minimum densities and alternative sewer service policies are intended to achieve appropriate urban growth in UGAs. Urban Reserve lot size requirements of 10 acres are intended to maintain larger lot sizes that could later be platted to urban densities when these areas are included in a UGA in the future.

Response to Comment 18: Urban Restricted

With the Preferred Alternative, densities would be adjusted in the Urban Restricted zone so that they are measured by gross density minus critical areas. Buffer areas would not be removed based on comments received. A range of 1 to 5 dwellings per acre would be allowed dependent on the presence of critical areas. The number of units achievable would be less than those achieved under present (2005) regulations but slightly more than those under Alternative 2.

Regarding subdivision allowances in the Urban Restricted zone, to allow for property to remain in ownership of family members, the text regarding application requirements and conditions has been modified to exclude the text that would have had the County judging the applicant rather than the application.

Response to Comment 19: RWIP

The RWIP is intended to resolve the status of properties identified as Interim Rural Forest since 1998. These properties would be renamed as Rural Wooded. For a worst-case analysis, the DEIS reviews the potential use of the RWIP on the bulk of Rural Wooded properties (50,000 acres), and does note that it has the potential to continue the trend of an attractive rural area. However, as proposed in code amendments the RWIP is a pilot program and monitoring is required to determine the program's effect on rural lands. It allows for rural residential uses while protecting the ability to continue forest activities. The program in its initial stages would be limited to 5,000 acres, with no single project exceeding 500 acres. This limitation, along with monitoring, will enable the County to proceed carefully. In addition, cluster development and density bonuses are permitted by the GMA. (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(b))

Response to Comment 20: Areawide Rezones Generally

Please see Response to Comment 3. In addition, population banking allows the County to consider the best means to reallocate the 5% of growth not accommodated by the Preferred Alternative (similar to Alternative 2) through the use of UGAMAs. Further by holding 5% of the population allocation, this allows Reasonable Measures to make up the difference since DEIS Appendix H noted “[t]he seven quantifiable measures examined in this analysis are likely to account for somewhere in the range of 1%-5% of the forecast 20-year population growth, depending in large part on local real estate market conditions.”

Response to Comment 21: Kingston UGA

The comments regarding the pragmatic approach to the Arborwood development are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 22: Silverdale UGA

Support for downtown classifications and reasonable measures, as well as the UGA retraction at Barker Creek, is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Careful consideration of Urban Low Residential and Urban Restricted designations has been made, including review of mapped geologic hazards and other critical areas. Regarding seismic considerations, the analysis with Alternative 2 (and 3) in the DEIS notes: “Proposed UGA expansions in southwest Silverdale and northeast Port Orchard would occur in the vicinity of mapped fault lines. Most earthquakes along crustal faults like these are of low magnitude. More damage is likely to occur on areas prone to liquefaction, such as areas containing hydric soils, during larger regional earthquakes.” Mitigation measures include application of plan policies and critical areas regulations. In addition, in areas with high concentrations of critical areas (e.g. Dyes Inlet), Urban Restricted is applied to reduce densities. Urban Low that allows densities up to 9 units per acre is applied in other appropriate areas.

Response to Comment 23: Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton

Please see Response to Comment 11.

Response to Comment 24: Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA removes the Neighborhood Commercial expansion along Mile Hill Drive and converted large portions of the Bethel corridor from Highway Tourist Commercial to Mixed Use. This Mixed use designation provides further affordable and multi-family housing opportunities to the Port Orchard area than previously analyzed in the DEIS Alternative 2.

Response to Comment 25: Overall Comments

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 26: Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 27: 2025 Population

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA is less than 1% of its 2025 population target (within 2 persons of the target).

Response to Comment 28: UGA Expansions

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Land Use Element Section 2.2.3 regarding the added reasonable measures that the County is applying in all UGAs, including Port Orchard/South Kitsap to promote urban development in UGAs.

Response to Comment 29: Consistency with Goals & Policies

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA removed the Neighborhood Commercial expansion along Mile Hill Drive and converted large portions of the Bethel Corridor from Highway Tourist Commercial to Mixed Use. This Mixed use designation provides additional affordable and multi-family housing opportunities to the Port Orchard area, by further implementing the Sub-Area related policies. Please also refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 30: Land Supply

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 29. Please also refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 31: Transit Oriented Development

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 29. Please also refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 32: Multi-Family Housing

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Responses to Comments 27 and 29. Please also refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 33: Economic Development

Please refer to Section 3.2.3 of the DEIS, and FEIS Chapter 2 Table 2.6.4, for revised employment capacity and demand ratios since the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan is included in the 10-Year Update. Please refer to Response to Comment 29. Please also refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 34: Expansion of Commercial Uses

Please see Response to Comments 32 and 33.

Response to Comment 35: Employment Sectors

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Comment 33.

Response to Comment 36: Environmental Impacts

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Please also see Response to Comment 29 regarding the Port Orchard UGA boundaries in the 10-Year Update Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 37: Capital Facilities

Pursuant to the Kingston Sub-Area Plan CPSGMHB decision, the sewer reduction factor was removed in the analysis of the 10-Year Update Alternatives including the Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA. Also, the Preferred Alternative also removes the sewer reduction factor from land supply estimates. The Preferred Alternative includes policies and regulations supporting adequate urban wastewater service in UGAs.

Response to Comment 38: Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Chapter 3 of the DEIS and FEIS, as well as Volume I: Appendix A Capital Facilities Plan for 6-year planned improvements.

Response to Comment 39: Parks

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 38.

Response to Comment 40: Water Distribution

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 38.

Response to Comment 41: Compact Development Form

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comments 29 and 38.

Response to Comment 42: Other Planning Efforts

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Land Use Element Section 2.3 regarding the added reasonable measures that the County is applying in all UGAs, including Port Orchard/South Kitsap, to promote urban development in UGAs.

Response to Comment 43: Planning Commission Improvements

The comments in support of the Planning Commission recommendations regarding Mixed Use designations, changes to Highway Tourist Commercial designations, and improved consistency with Bremerton Plans are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 44: Shoreline Policy Changes

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include amendments to shoreline policies.

Response to Comment 45: TDR Program Changes

The Preferred Alternative includes modifications of the TDR program:

- Required only for Site-Specific and rezone requests (remove requirement for height increases).
- Rural properties who have sold a development right may be allowed to restore the right by purchasing one from another rural property. As noted by the commenter, this will maintain the net effect of transferring density from a rural to an urban area.
- Include language stating if property that has sold a development right is included in a UGA through a Comprehensive or Sub-Area planning effort, the development right may be restored for urban development. Further modified from the Planning Commission recommendations, the BOCC approved language that would allow the flexibility to determine, at the time of a comprehensive plan docking resolution, whether to require TDRs for sub-area or comprehensive planning efforts..

Response to Comment 46: Continued Support to Kitsap County

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 11 Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

Response to Comment 1: Pleased with Organizational Improvements and Interjurisdictional Coordination

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Rural Lands Goal 4

The support for policies addressing open space protection, TDR, and purchase of development rights is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Rural Lands Goal 6, Limit LAMIRDs, Promote Shoreline Restoration

The County's implementation of LAMIRD policies would follow GMA and CPSGMHB direction. See Responses to Letter No. 9, Suquamish Tribe, Comments 9 and 10, . Shoreline restoration is addressed in the Shorelines Element of the Plan. The County's Shoreline Management Program is expected to be updated by 2011 in accordance with State deadlines.

Response to Comment 4: Natural Resources Goals

The comments that the natural resources goals are important to protection of fish and wildlife species diversity are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Rural Wooded Policies

Regarding coordination of open space tracts, please see Response to Letter No. 9, Comment 11, Suquamish Tribe. The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note the RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time, including vesting and rural densities.

Response to Comment 6: TDR Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 9 Comment 12, Suquamish Tribe.

Response to Comment 7: TDR Program and Length of Open Space Protection

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The DEIS studied the 20-year growth allocation and associated land use plans and regulations to implement the 20-year Comprehensive Plan. The TDR program provides for greater protection for rural areas than exists today (as of December 2005), and will serve to meter UGA expansions and intensifications. In addition, County critical area regulations will continue to apply whether located in urban or rural areas, and whether in the TDR program or not. The County intends to monitor the TDR program. The DEIS addressed the program as written in this context. Also, see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 223.

Response to Comment 8: Open Space Connectivity, Use of County Assessment

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that Draft Policy NS-51 was deleted in the Preferred Plan since it repeated Draft Policy NS-67, but the concept of habitat protection remains.

Response to Comment 9: Policy Encouraging Clustered Development

The comments that the Department can provide further technical assistance in the promotion of clustering are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 10: Support Non-Regulatory Approaches to Conservation

Draft Policy NS-71 addresses water quality in Hood Canal. Other policies address water quality more broadly.

Response to Comment 11: Reference Shared Strategy

The Shared Strategy Process was added into the draft policy as suggested in the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 12: Shorelines Chapter

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the County will be addressing a Shoreline Master Program Update by the State deadline of 2011.

Response to Comment 13: UGA Expansion and Areawide Rezones

Please see Response to Letter No. 10, Comment 3, Washington State Department of Community Development.

Response to Comment 14: Urban Low Minimum Densities

Please see Response to Letter No. 10, Comment 3, Washington State Department of Community Development.

Response to Comment 15: Low Impact Development Ordinance

The comment encouraging low impact development is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Section 2.2.11 of the Land Use Element includes goals and policies supporting low impact development and these are considered a high priority for implementation in Chapter 18 of the Plan.

Response to Comment 16: Appreciation for Opportunity to Comment and Offer for Additional Technical Assistance

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 12 Washington State Department of Transportation

Response to Comment 1: Use of Draft WSDOT Plan

It is standard practice to incorporate information from adopted plans of neighboring and regional jurisdictions rather than draft plans; and under GMA, it is expected that each jurisdiction will identify funding for improvements it has determined are needed to address transportation deficiencies on its facilities. At the time of Kitsap County's plan preparation (Spring through early November; received County decision-maker approval on November 6, 2006), the best available plan information represented the Washington Transportation Plan in effect prior to November 14, 2006 (the date of the Washington State Transportation Commission's new plan). Thus, the County feels that it was appropriate to use the adopted Washington Transportation Plan (WTP) in effect during the County's plan preparation for the DEIS and FEIS as the basis for identifying future improvements that have been identified to address existing and future deficiencies on state highways over which WSDOT has jurisdiction.

The commenter's statement that the list of state highway improvements will change in the updated WTP is noted. It is also noted that the State's new plan that is completing its review process as of mid-November is considered a "transitional plan" per the cover letter: "Given the recent changes in transportation governance, the Transportation Commission views this plan as a transitional effort, bridging its past role with its revised mission to formulate future plans and visions for transportation. The Transportation Commission will spend the next two years furthering the evolution of this plan; culminating in an amended version in time for the 2009 legislative session and budget deliberations, as required under statute." Consistent with RCW 36.70A.070, the County has identified potential impacts to state facilities considering improvements that the State previously identified as being necessary, and based on this same section of GMA, it is expected that the state will use this information to help plan improvements. It is hoped that WSDOT will review transportation issues from a needs-based perspective, identify necessary capacity and programmatic improvements, and fund the appropriate projects based on identified needs.

It is the County's intention to update and recalibrate its countywide travel demand model in 2007, and subsequently re-evaluate the county concurrency program and long-range list of transportation improvement projects. At that time the new WTP, could be included in the countywide model.

Response to Comment 2: Concurrency System

The current concurrency standards, as adopted by the County and certified by the PSRC in the current plan, have traditionally been measured on a countywide basis, but also allow for measurement on a sub-area basis (see Policy T-88). In order to strengthen the County's ability to apply the concurrency threshold on a sub-area basis, mitigation recommendations in the DEIS include amendment to the Kitsap County Code to define the area of impact for proposed developments, for the purpose of sub-area concurrency testing. In addition, the County is

considering an intersection LOS standard in its proposed policies. For environmental review purposes the DEIS reviews intersection LOS under each of the alternatives.

Response to Comment 3: Clarify Operational Standards

Operational standards refer to level of service standards.

Response to Comment 4: Transferring County Roads to WSDOT

Regarding the mitigation measure suggesting that Kitsap County transfer county roads to WSDOT, the reasoning behind this idea stemmed not from moving the congestion problem to another jurisdiction but that SR166 currently ends at the eastern city limits of Port Orchard and SE Mile Hill Drive, a county road, continues from that point to the Washington State Ferry terminal at Southworth. The suggestion that Lake Flora Road/Glenwood Road might be of interest to the state stems from the fact that the Belfair By-Pass is expected to end at SR3 with the possibility that it might at some time be extended into Kitsap County at or near Lake Flora/Glenwood, which would then be a candidate for a state route designation. These would be very long-term mitigation measures and may be apart of future discussions with WSDOT.

The list of potential mitigation measures presented in the DEIS and included in the FEIS with potential financial implications are intended to present the widest range possible of measures that could be considered. It was noted in the tables that “[t]his measure would require legislative action by the State Legislature and the Kitsap County Council.” Therefore, it is not a simple matter, and would only proceed with State authorization. The detailed six-year transportation improvement program (TIP) does not include this strategy.

Response to Comment 5: Appreciation for Opportunity to Comment

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 13 Washington State University, Kitsap County Extension

Response to Comment 1: Opinion Survey – Farming and Rural Activities

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please note that while the County does not contain areas meeting GMA definitions for agricultural areas of long-term commercial significance, the County’s proposed vision amendments and rural policies support farming in Kitsap County. Please see the Comprehensive Plan Chapter 1 for the “rural areas” vision bullet that says in part “Natural resource activities, such as forestry, agriculture, and mining continue to contribute to the rural character and economy.” Also see the Rural chapter policies including Policy RL-60 “Encourage and allow farming and agricultural activities in the designated rural areas of the County and consider them an important rural activity.”

Response to Comment 2: Assure Opinions are in Policies and Vision

See Response to Comment 1 above.

Response to Comment 3: Economic Development Chapter and Rural Areas

While the Economic Development Element does not focus on rural areas in the “Relationship to Vision” table which is just a summary overview, please note that rural areas are considered in Economic Development policies under Goal 6, as well as in Rural chapter policies described in Response to Comment 1.

See Preferred Alternative Volume I, Chapter 5 where a bullet is added to the “Relationship to Vision” table to note that the Economic Development Element “Recognizes economic development in rural villages and rural commercial and industrial areas.” Also see the Rural and Resources Lands Chapter regarding support for natural resource activities.

Response to Comment 4: Add Education Goal

Please see Policy ED-2 which says: “Establish, maintain, expand and support higher educational opportunities to ensure an educated and technically trained work force. Expand opportunities in both new and existing institutions, including vocational, post-secondary and professional training opportunities.”

5.2. Citizens, Businesses and Property Owners

5.2.1. North Kitsap

Table 5.2-1 lists citizen, business and property owner comment letters that pertain to North Kitsap County (as defined by Commissioner Districts) received during the public comment period. The agency letters appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment.

Table 5.2-1. North Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
14	Arness, Suzanne		8/29/2006
15	Arness, Suzanne		8/29/2006
16	Arness, Suzanne		9/7/2006
17	Bass, Jere		10/23/2006
18	Belling, Karen		9/29/2006
19	Bergum, Julie		9/20/2006
20	Bickler, Gail and Jerome		9/18/2006
21	Bird, Brandon	Olympic Property Group	10/30/2006
22	Brooke, Larry		10/27/2006
23	Carmen, Patti		9/9/2006

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
24	Clemons, Kevin		9/14/2006
25	Cooper, Betsy		9/27/2006
26	Dawes, John		10/22/2006
27	Fink, Alyssa		9/21/2006
28	Fink, Emily		9/21/2006
29	Fink, Scott		9/21/2006
30	Fink, Sue		9/14/2006
31	Gilman, Quentin	H & G Investors	8/30/2006
32	Lange, Juel		9/20/2006
33	Mauser, Joy		10/22/2006
34	Maxwell, Nancy		9/20/2006
35	Minder, Gary		9/22/2006
36	Minder, Gary		9/22/2006
37	Mitchell, Terry		10/27/2006
38	Morse, Nina L.		9/20/2006
39	Nelson, Fred		8/29/2006
40	Nevins, Tom		10/22/2006
41	Palmer, Bill	on behalf of Suzuki Family LLC	10/23/2006
42	Paulsen, Bob and Pat		9/21/2006
43	Peterson, Steve		9/14/2006
44	Petition		9/20/2006
45	Porter, Gerald W.		9/21/2006
46	Redd, John and Muriel		9/26/2006
47	Rose, Jon	Olympic Property Group	10/23/2006
48	Ross, Nadean		9/21/2006
49	Ross, Ron		9/14/2006
50	Ross, Ron		9/14/2006
51	Ross, Ron		9/14/2006
52	Ross, Ron		9/21/2006
53	Ross, Ron		9/30/2006
54	Ross, Ronald and Lillian		10/30/2006
55	Rudolph, Dale		9/18/2006

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
56	Sole, Jon		10/24/2006
57	Stanton, Donna and Mike		9/21/2006
58	Suzuki, Paul	Suzuki Family LLC	10/1/2006
59	Youderian, Brian and Linda		10/30/2006
60	Youngquist, John		9/14/2006
61	Youngquist, John		9/20/2006

Letter No. 14 Arness, Susan: August 29, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Appreciate Flexibility in Kingston Mixed Use Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 15 Arness, Susan: August 29, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Trails to the North Offering Access to Ferry

The Preferred Alternative UGA boundaries recognize the approach recommended by the Kingston Phase II working group, a citizen group and approved by the BOCC. In the future as UGA boundaries are reviewed, it is possible that areas to the north served by trails could be considered.

Letter No. 16 Arness, Susan: September 7, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Concern about NASCAR Effects on Roads

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1, Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 17 Bass, Jere M.

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1, Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 18 Belling, Karen

Response to Comment 1: Keep Central Valley Rural, Avoid Sprawl

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No.19 Bergum, Julie

Response to Comment 1: Support Alternative 1 for Poulsbo

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The BOCC approved Alternative 2 for Poulsbo UGA, conditioned on the City of Poulsbo approval. The City of Poulsbo on November 8, 2006 did not agree on Alternative 2 land use changes or UGA boundary expansions, therefore applying Alternative 1 to Poulsbo.

Please note that the Poulsbo UGA population allocation is not met with Alternative 1 (-226), but comes closer with Alternative 2 (-34). The FEIS identifies that further coordination between the City and the County is needed to address the population allocation shortfall with the application of Alternative 1 as part of the Preferred Alternative. Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS Section 3.2.3 for UGAs not meeting targets include population allocation banking or shifting population between UGAs that have greater potential to be densified or expanded to accommodate population, additional reasonable measures to increase densities, or UGA expansions, as appropriate. It is likely that the County and City will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding regarding a process to determine how to resolve the 2025 population target, land use, UGA boundaries, etc.

Response to Comment 2: Densify First

The capacity analysis prepared for Poulsbo and its UGA considered densification on vacant and underdeveloped properties. First applying growth in the City limits, and then in the UGA. Please see Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 3: Critical Areas and Johnson Creek

Mapping is based on existing available information. However, critical area regulations are applied based on site-specific conditions even if not shown on available mapping. The City of Poulsbo is considering critical areas regulations currently. The County has adopted critical areas regulations. For site-specific development SEPA requirements would apply as well.

Response to Comment 4: Adopt Alternative 1 for Poulsbo

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 20 Bickler, Gail and Jerome

Response to Comment 1: Royal Valley Inclusion in Alternative 2

The purpose of the July 10, 2006 hearing was to obtain testimony on the range of the Alternatives to be studied in the environmental analysis (DEIS), particularly Alternative 2 the medium growth option.

At the July 10, 2006 hearing the BOCC and Planning Commission received two versions of the proposed Alternative 2, one with a UGA boundary that extended to Waaga Way similar to a map provided for public review at the May 2006 Alternatives Workshops, and Alternative 2A

recommended by the Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). The CAC focused on the Silverdale UGA but also recommended that the Royal Valley/Minder land use reclassification requests, as submitted to the Silverdale CAC, be included in the Central Kitsap UGA. The Planning Commission and BOCC reviewed the CAC recommendations and the citizen comments. The Planning Commission recommended inclusion of the Royal Valley/Minder properties in Alternative 2 for purposes of environmental analysis, and the BOCC ultimately provided the same direction.

County decision-makers have held additional hearings following the issuance of draft Plan/DEIS. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Sewer Availability

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. DEIS Appendix E notes that a sewer line runs through the property, but does not indicate that the line can be easily accessed by development or if improvements are necessary prior to development. See also Response to Comment 6 in Letter No. 195.

Response to Comment 3: Critical Areas on Property

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 4: Traffic Increases

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Transportation analysis is included in DEIS Section 3.2.6. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 5: Protect Rural Area

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 21 Bird, Brandon, Olympic Property Group

Response to Comment 1: Forestry Activities in Open Space Tracts

The comments regarding Forestry Activities are considered an allowable use within the Open Space Tracts of the RWIP are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Volume III. The comments regarding the proposal for a 1,000 contiguous acres for a single rural wooded development application limit are also noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. As a pilot program, it will be monitored.

Letter No. 22 Brooke, Larry

Response to Comment 1: Submittal of Letter and Maps

Please see Response to Comment 2 below.

Response to Comment 2: Request for Rural Industrial

The focus of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update was on sizing and composition of Urban Growth Areas. The County annually considers offering a site-specific land use reclassification request period. The County intends to focus more on Rural areas in 2007. Applying through a site-specific process will require an application. Please contact the Kitsap County Department of Community Development for more information.

Letter No. 23 Carmen, Patti

Response to Comment 1: Trails and Road Planning

Several County Plans have proposed interconnected trail systems throughout Kitsap County. The Mosquito Fleet Trail Plan proposes a bicycle and pedestrian trail system that runs from Manchester to Kingston on an off of public roadways. The Greenways Plan provides for a number of recreational trail systems throughout the rural areas. Costs associated with trail systems (right-of-way/easement acquisition, construction and long-term maintenance) require the County to seek other forms of funding beyond property taxes. A majority of property taxes collected by the County go to school, fire and other special purpose districts with the County receiving only a small amount. This amount is further constrained by Initiative 747 that caps property tax increases at 1% (not including voter-approved increases such as levies and bonds). I-747 is still in effect, but is on appeal at the time of this writing.

Response to Comment 2: NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1, Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 24 Clemons, Kevin

Response to Comment 1: Central Valley Should Remain Rural

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative excludes land north of Waaga Way from the Central Kitsap UGA.

Letter No. 25 Cooper, Betsy

Response to Comment 1: Rural Wooded Approach Does not Protect Rural Character

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the

50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 2: Give TDR Program More Time

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. A TDR program is intended to function as a reasonable measure to promote growth in urban areas and provide for greater rural character protection. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of TDR policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative. Sending and receiving areas are identified in the proposed regulations.

Response to Comment 3: Rural Sewer and Rural Emergency Access Policies

Policy RL-12 directly quotes GMA provisions that limit the ability of the County to extend sewer in rural areas. Amending the quoted State Law is not proposed as part of the 10-Year Update since state law will govern.

Policy RL-13 states “Provide road and access standards that enable all-weather access for emergency response vehicles while preserving and enhancing rural character.” This is an existing policy in the adopted 1998 Comprehensive Plan (Policy RL-7). The intent is to recognize the need to provide access by emergency service vehicles in a manner that protects rural character. The County’s obligations to provide for public safety is not intended to promote rural growth.

Response to Comment 4: Capital Facilities – Show Concurrency for Roads, Sewers, and Water

DEIS and FEIS Section 3.3 addresses demand for public services over the 20-year planning period. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies specific projects, costs and funding for the GMA-required 6-year period.

Policy CF-2 identifies the facilities are required for concurrency and those facilities that are required to be adequate for new development. The policies are consistent with *McVittie v. Snohomish County*, CPSGMHB Case No. 99-3-0016c, Final Decision and Order (February 7, 2000), which defined GMA’s requirements for capital facilities:

“... the Act’s requirements [are to] to plan for and provide necessary public infrastructure, including (1) concurrency mechanisms for, at the very least, transportation levels of service and (2) adequacy mechanisms for the other public facilities identified in its Capital Facilities Plan as necessary to support development.”

“The answer to question 4 – Does Goal 12 require ‘concurrency’ for all public facilities and services, beyond the explicit concurrency requirement contained in RCW 36.70A.070(6)(b) for transportation? - is no. Goal 12 allows local governments to determine what facilities and services are necessary to support development and develop

an enforcement mechanism for ensuring that identified necessary facilities and services for development are adequate and available.”

Please also see Response to Letter No. 129 Comment 10, Jerry Harless in Section 5.2.3 regarding providing adequate sewer.

Response to Comment 5: Sewers in UGAs

The 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update includes new policies to address innovative sewer techniques to allow for sewer service in UGAs. For example see policies LU-14 through 16 in the Land Use Element. Please also see Response to Letter No. 129 Comment 10, Jerry Harless in Section 5.2.3 regarding providing adequate sewer.

The change in Urban Low and Urban Cluster density ranges (from 5-9 du/ac to 4-9 du/ac) is intended to respond to citizen input regarding residential character while still meeting urban densities as defined in CPSGMHB cases applicable to Kitsap County. The density *range* allows flexibility to provide for development that can be cost-effectively served with sewers.

Response to Comment 6: Johnson Creek Preservation

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The City of Poulsbo is considering critical areas regulations currently. The County has adopted critical areas regulations. Please also see Response to Letter No. 19 Comment 1, Julie Bergum.

Response to Comment 7: Do not Upzone Ross Property North of Waaga Way

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see FEIS Chapter 2. The Preferred Alternative does not expand the UGA north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 8: Do Not Adopt NASCAR Placeholder Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 26 Dawes, John C.

Response to Comment 1: Vote Against Changing Rules for SKIA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton. Responses to Comments by Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning are addressed in Section 5.3 of this Chapter.

Letter No. 27 Fink, Alyssa

Response to Comment 1: Don't Develop Central Valley – Air Pollution and Traffic

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Air quality and transportation analysis is included in DEIS Chapters 3.1 and 3.2. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Harm to Habitat

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 28 Fink, Emily

Response to Comment 1: Do not Allow Development Near Paulson Road

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 29 Fink, Scott

Response to Comment 1: UGA Expansion north of Waaga Way Huge Impact to Rural Lifestyle and Environment

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Central Valley – Great Schools and Rural Living

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: UGA Expansion Harms Environment

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 4: Remove Property North of Highway 303

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 30 Fink, Sue

Response to Comment 1: Central Valley Should Remain Rural

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 31 Gilman, Quentin

Response to Comment 1: Rezone Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA identifies these properties remaining Urban Low residential.

Response to Comment 2: Response to Comment 2: Preferred Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see DEIS Section 3.2.3 regarding the need to balance the level of commercial growth given employment targets and land demand, and the need to promote residential growth in Central Kitsap to meet population allocations.

Letter No. 32 Lange, Juel

Response to Comment 1: Country Restaurants in County Zoning

Volume III of the Comprehensive Plan Update addresses code amendments considered together with the Comprehensive Plan. Areas designated for commercial uses outside of UGAs (e.g. NC, HTC, LAMIRDS and similar) typically permit restaurant uses.

Response to Comment 2: Allow High Density near Bangor and Keyport

Higher density housing is allowed in Urban Growth Areas, such as downtown Silverdale east of Bangor. A subarea plan for Keyport is expected to be developed which may result in a LAMIRD designation. That designation may allow for other housing densities within that classification.

Letter No. 33 Mauser, Joy

Response to Comment 1: Vote No on Changing Zoning for NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 34 Maxwell, Nancy

Response to Comment 1: Support Alternative 1 for Poulsbo

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 19 Comment 1, Julie Bergum.

Letter No. 35 Minder, Gary

Response to Comment 1: Remove Area North of Highway 303

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Consistent with its comprehensive plan amendment regulations, the County considered land use reclassification requests in developing land use alternatives to test for environmental impacts. The DEIS reviews natural and built environment impacts of DEIS Alternatives 2 and 3 that included nearly all land use reclassification requests throughout the County including the UGA expansion request north of Waaga Way. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 36 Minder, Gary

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Silverdale Alternative 3

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 37 Mitchell, Terry

Response to Comment 1: Preserve Central Valley

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 38 Morse, Nina L.

Response to Comment 1: Central Valley Resident Interested in Update

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Do not Support Central Valley UGA Expansion due to Sprawl

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 3: Highway 303 is a Natural Barrier to Urban Uses

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 4: UGA Expansion Would Be a Mistake

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 5: Sewer Access Not Available

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. DEIS Appendix E notes that a sewer line runs through the property, but does not indicate that the line can be accessed by development or if improvements are necessary prior to development. See also Response to Comment 6, Letter No. 195.

Response to Comment 6: Best Available Science

Please note that the May et al. 1997 study (see Chapter 6 for full citation) regarding urbanization and streams was considered in the analysis of natural environment impacts for the programmatic review of land use alternatives. See DEIS page 3.1-92.

Response to Comment 7: Salmon Stream Present

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 8: Do not Consider Urban Low North of Highway 303

The DEIS Alternatives 2 and 3 reviewed Urban Restricted classifications in the Central Valley area, which has a density range of either 1-4 du/ac in Alternative 2 or 1-5 du/ac in Alternative 3. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way and would retain rural densities.

Response to Comment 9: Support Alternative 2 without UGA Expansion north of Waaga Way

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 39 Nelson, Fred

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Urban Restricted Density Range Reduction to Maximum of 4 Units Per Acre

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the density range of 1-5 dwelling units per acre. It also adjusts density to be calculated based on gross acres minus critical areas. This is similar to the Alternative 2 approach, but it does not exclude buffers from the density calculation and retains the upper density limit of 5 du/ac.

Letter No. 40 Nevins, Tom

Response to Comment 1: Review Process

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Planning Commission Review and Individual Concerns

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Remove IMPRA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 4: RWIP Deserves Closer Look

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the RWIP as a pilot program with minor changes to give the BOCC flexibility to review and, if appropriate, approve future extensions of the program.

Response to Comment 5: UGA Expansion Reduce UGA Expansion; Consider Holding Zone

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative removes the Neighborhood Commercial UGA extension along Mile Hill Road. In addition, a requirement that residential development be served by urban level wastewater services has been added to the code implementing the policies identified in the Draft Plan. See also Response to Comment 4, Letter No. 25.

Response to Comment 6: Carefully Consider Recommendations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 41 Palmer, Bill (Suzuki Family LLC)

Response to Comment 1: Include Suzuki Property in Kingston UGA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Consistent with its comprehensive plan amendment procedures, the County considered private land use reclassification requests in developing the Kingston Sub-Area Plan. A request for the subject property was not received by the April 10, 2006 deadline and not studied in the 10-Year Update DEIS or Plan alternatives. In the future, the property owner may submit a site-specific land use reclassification request in accordance with County annual plan amendment procedures.

Letter No. 42 Paulsen, Bob and Pat

Response to Comment 1: Oppose UGA Expansion North of Waaga Way

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Make Decision with Best Available Science

Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1.

Letter No. 43 Peterson, Steve

Response to Comment 1: Keep Central Valley Rural

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 44 Petition Against Rezoning Royal Valley, Minder Corporation

Response to Comment 1: Oppose UGA Expansion North of Waaga Way

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Rural Density is Instrumental in Protecting Habitat

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Comment 1.

Letter No. 45 Porter, Gerald L.

Response to Comment 1: How will County Afford Infrastructure

DEIS and FEIS Section 3.3 addresses demand for public services over the 20-year planning period. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies specific projects, costs and funding for the GMA-required 6-year period.

Response to Comment 2: If IMPRA Established, Need Development to Pay for Infrastructure

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 46 Redd, John and Muriel

Response to Comment 1: Highway 303 is a Natural Barrier to Growth

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 47 Rose, John, Olympic Property Group

Response to Comment 1: Kitsap County Rural Lot Sales

The submission of materials related to the Olympic Property Group rural parcel sales and your comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Olympic Property Group Rural Lot Sales

The submission of materials related to the rural lifestyles program and comments regarding the number of rural parcels sold during the creation of an adoptable RWIP are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Restoration of Rural Equity

The comments regarding restoration of equity in the rural areas are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Forestry Activities in Open Space Tracts

The comments regarding Forestry Activities should be considered an allowable use within the Open Space Tracts of the RWIP are noted. Please refer to Volume III. The comment regarding the proposal for a 1,000 contiguous acres for a single rural wooded development application limit are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding the further study of wooded shoreline enhancement program are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. As a pilot program it is intended that the program be monitored and re-visited.

Letter No. 48 Ross, Nadean

Response to Comment 1: Concern about Need for Staffing

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The EIS (Volume II) and Capital Facilities Plan (Volume I Plan Appendix A) estimate the need for County administration building space, which is an indirect measure of additional future staffing needs.

Response to Comment 2: Wildlife Corridors

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that unincorporated property in the County is given a plan designation consistent with the natural environment and land use character of the area and future growth projections. Development may occur consistent with allowable densities and development standards, whether rural or urban.

Letter No. 49 Ross, Ron (9/14/06, North Perry)

Response to Comment 1: North Perry Water System and Mapping

The water system map in DEIS Section 3.3 is based on information from service providers that have provided information to the County. Appendix N of the DEIS shows a more detailed view of water district service areas in the Silverdale vicinity including North Perry. The County has coordinated with all public water districts in the development of the 6-Year Capital Facilities Program, and information regarding water availability in relation to planned growth was shared mutually. Through on-going coordination efforts, the County can obtain GIS information as it is available from the water districts.

Letter No. 50 Ross, Ron (9/14/06; Mixed Use)

Response to Comment 1: Lower Density as Minimum in Mixed Use Zone

The intent of the Mixed Use zone is to encourage higher density development to provide additional housing types and maximize infrastructure improvements. Lowering the minimum density removes the zone's value for these purposes and as a reasonable measure.

Letter No. 51 Ross, Ron (9/14/06; TDR)

Response to Comment 1: Request for TDR Program Clarity

The comment regarding the TDR Program and request for further clarity within the regulations are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The cited Kitsap County Code Section 21.08.110 does reference the defined Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map as the map to be amended, and is further refined by Subsection Items A through G under that code section. All references within subsection Items A through G to “Land Use Map” may be considered to refer to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map.

Response to Comment 2: TDR Certificates

The comments regarding the TDR Program are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Certificate of Development Credit is intended to serve as a documentation of the development credit for any given parcel participating in the TDR Program. The Kitsap County Department of Community Development is proposing to create a Public Information Brochure to further explain the TDR program and process.

Letter No. 52 Ross, Ron (9/21/06)

Response to Comment 1: Submittal of Buck and Gordon Report on Kitsap Code

The submittal is part of the FEIS record. Please see Chapter 2 for a discussion of code amendments associated with the 10-Year Update. Additional code amendments are planned to improve the development code regulations in 2007 and beyond.

Letter No. 53 Ross, Ron (9/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Why Not Compensated for Prior Downzone

The 1998 Comprehensive Plan was prepared in accordance with the GMA, as is the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update.

Letter No. 54 Ross, Ron (10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Removal of Acres from Central Kitsap UGA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The County considered alternatives that included and excluded the Barker Creek Corridor. Allowances for “urban separators” are consistent with the Countywide Planning Policies and the GMA. Existing development in the rural corridor can retain access to utilities that are present.

Response to Comment 2: Nels Nelson Road Area

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Legally developed land uses can remain as grandfathered in the area that would now be located in the rural area.

Vacant lots that were lawfully created can be developed with a home pursuant to County regulations.

Response to Comment 3: Addition in Gilberton/Brownsville Area

Land in the Gilberton area is added to the Preferred Alternative as part of the Central Kitsap UGA similar to Alternatives 2 and 3. It was identified as an Urban Reserve Area in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. The 10-Year Update identifies alternative sewer technologies as allowed in the UGA, and now requires urban wastewater service for new residential development.

Response to Comment 4: UGA Boundary Locations Lack Sense

Please see Responses to Comments 1 through 3.

Response to Comment 5: Net Loss of UGA Land

Please see Response to Comment 1 regarding Barker Creek. The area north of Waaga Way was identified as Urban Restricted in Alternatives 2 and 3 due to environmentally sensitive features and was not identified as suitable for typical urban densities. An UGAMA between the County and the City of Bremerton, involving citizen input, is proposed in 2007-08 to more precisely determine population re-allocation, future land use, and service delivery in Central Kitsap.

Response to Comment 6: Area North of Waaga Way

Please see Response to Comment 5.

Response to Comment 7: Solution to Retain Current UGA Boundaries and Extend to Royal Valley, Gilberton, and Brownsville

Please see Responses to Comments 1 to 5 above.

Response to Comment 8: Kitsap County High Growth Rate

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 9: Meet all GMA Goals

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. An analysis of consistency with GMA provisions is provided in Section 3.2.2 of the DEIS.

Letter No. 55 Rudolph, Dale

Response to Comment 1: Navy Encroachment & Countywide Planning Policies

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Consistency review of the Countywide Planning Policies has been completed and can be viewed in Section 3.2.2 of the DEIS.

On July 24, 2006, Naval Base Kitsap submitted comments and attended and participated in numerous Silverdale Citizen Advisory Committee meetings. Contained in the July letter, Naval Base Kitsap indicated little or no concern over location of the Alternative Silverdale UGA

boundaries and its proposed uses near the Bangor Sub-Base borders. The letter did indicate concern over traffic, water quality and quantity, and habitat fragmentation causing fauna and flora migration on the subbase. An analysis of potential impacts and mitigation measures is provided in Section 3.1.4 of the DEIS. Please visit the Kitsap County Department of Community to view or receive a copy of the July 24, 2006 letter.

Letter No. 56 Sole, John N.

Response to Comment 1: Vote Against Zoning for SKIA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 57 Stanton, Donna and Mike

Response to Comment 1: Oppose UGA Expansion North of Waaga Way

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 58 Suzuki, Paul

Response to Comment 1: Request a Rezone from Rural to Urban Restricted in Kingston

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Consistent with its comprehensive plan amendment regulations, the County considered private land use reclassification requests in developing the Kingston Sub-Area Plan. A request for the subject property was not received by the April 10, 2006 deadline and not studied in the 10-Year Update DEIS or Plan alternatives. In the future, the property owner may submit a site-specific land use reclassification request in accordance with County annual plan amendment procedures.

Response to Comment 2: Property Would Help Achieve Population Growth and Low Impact Development Goals in Urban Areas

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the similar to Alternative 2, the Preferred Alternative for Kingston is within 1.5% of the population target assigned to the UGA without further expansions.

Letter No. 59 Youderain, Brian and Linda

Response to Comment 1: Move Silverdale UGA Away from Central Valley Road

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. One portion of the Silverdale UGA in Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative abuts the Central Valley Road to include an area that has already been platted at higher densities.

Letter No. 60 Youngquist, John (9/14/06)

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Including Royal Valley into UGA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 61 Youngquist, John (9/20/06)

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Waaga Way UGA Expansion

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

5.2.2. Central Kitsap

Table 5.2-2 lists citizen, business and property owner comment letters that pertain to Central Kitsap County (as defined by Commissioner Districts) received during the public comment period. The agency letters appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment.

Table 5.2-2. Central Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
62	Boyer, Audrey		9/14/2006
63	Brockus, A.C.		9/14/2006
64	Brophy, Jim		10/22/2006
65	Cadwell, Rick		9/13/2006
66	Cadwell, Rick		10/10/2006
67	Davis, Kathleen		9/19/2006
68	Dokken, Jim		10/23/2006
69	Hasslinger, James		9/18/2006
70	Hellthaler, Petra		10/23/2006
71	Jensen, Jack R.		9/21/2006
72	Krigsman, Irwin		9/21/2006
73	Krigsman, Judith		8/29/2006
74	Krigsman, Judith		8/29/2006
75	Krigsman, Judith		9/20/2006
76	Krigsman, Judith		9/20/2006
77	Krigsman, Judith		10/30/2006

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
78	Kuhlman, Mark		10/30/2006
79	Larabee, Kent		10/27/2006
80	Larson, Bruce		10/23/2006
81	Lindsey, Gary		9/21/2006
82	Lindsey, Gary		10/23/2006
83	Lyle, Jean		9/14/2006
84	McLemore, Janice		9/25/2006
85	Mentor, Joe		10/30/2006
86	Munie, N. Jean		9/21/2006
87	Palmer, Bill		10/25/2006
88	Paulson, Jenny		10/22/2006
89	Peterson, Dave		10/2/2006
90	Slaninka, Laurel		9/15/2006
91	Smidt, Colleen		9/20/2006
92	Smith, John		10/27/2006
93	Stasny, John and Maggie		10/23/2006
94	Stodden, Nancy K.		10/2/2006
95	Thorne, Marge		9/21/2006
96	Thorpe, Robert	R.W. Thorpe & Associates	10/26/2006
97	Trainer, Jim		9/20/2006
98	Trainer, Jim	Treez Inc.	9/21/2006
99	Trygstad, Julie		9/14/2006
100	Warden, Terri	Beyond Mortgage	10/30/2006

Letter No. 62 Boyer, Audrey

Response to Comment 1: County Staff are Well Informed

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 63 Brockus, A.C.

Response to Comment 1: Coordinate with Bremerton on UGA Plan and Boundaries

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The County has coordinated with the City of Bremerton through individual staff meetings and through participation in the KRCC. In addition Plan policies support UGAMAs to further coordinate land use and service delivery.

Letter No. 64 Brophy, Jim

Response to Comment 1: No on NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 65 Cadwell, Rick

Response to Comment 1: Request Mixed Use Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the subject property as High Density Residential. Please note that that zone does allow for limited non-residential uses including small scale mixed uses and commercial uses.

Letter No. 66 Cadwell, Rick

Response to Comment 1: Dyes Inlet Preservation Council Open Space Study Not Relevant

Comments regarding the Preliminary Report prepared by Open Space Resources, Inc. for the Dyes Inlet Preservation Council are noted. This report was prepared in June 1999 and was not formally adopted by Kitsap County. A copy of this report is included in Chapter 5, Section 5.3 of this FEIS as an attachment to Letter No. 201, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Jennifer A. Dold).

Response to Comment 2: Kenlon Support for Reclassification

Comments regarding Mr. Kenlon's support for your reclassification request are noted. The referenced opposition letter from Mr. Kenlon (dated February 29, 1996) is included of this FEIS as an attachment to Letter No. 201, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Jennifer A. Dold).

Response to Comment 3: Urban Restricted Zoning Designation Not Applicable

Comments regarding the applicability of the Urban Restricted zoning designation to your property are noted. As stated, the reclassification request included a letter review of critical areas on your property, (letter dated July 29, 2005 from Joanne Bartlett, Wiltermood Associates). Although this review did not identify critical area constraints on the property, Kitsap County has not formally reviewed or accepted this document. At the time of site-specific applications, the

County will apply relevant regulations based on site conditions, and can review submitted reports at that time.

Response to Comment 4: Support for Urban High/Mixed Use Designation

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Request for Redesignation to Mixed Use Designation

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative designates the site at 9506 Mickelberry Road as Urban Medium/Urban High Density Residential in the Comprehensive Plan, with an implementing zoning designation of Urban High Density Residential (19 – 30 units/acre). See Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 65.

Letter No. 67 Davis, Kathleen

Response to Comment 1: Oppose David LURR South of Anderson Hill Road, Silverdale

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see the DEIS discussion of Alternative 2 for natural and built environment impacts as well as proposed mitigation measures. The Preferred Alternative continues to propose the Urban Restricted zone at 1-5 du/ac. The Urban Restricted zone is applied due to the critical areas sensitivity. The critical areas regulations will also apply to future proposed development.

Letter No. 68 Dokken, Jim

Response to Comment 1: No on NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 69 Hasslinger, James

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Zoning to Allow NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton letter.

Letter No. 70 Hellthaler, Petra

Response to Comment 1: Don't Change Rules for NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton letter.

Letter No. 71 Jensen, Jack R.

Response to Comment 1: Support Urban Restricted at 1-4 DU/Ac

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative proposes the Urban Restricted zone at 1-5 du/ac similar to Alternative 1, but alters the calculation of density (gross acres minus critical areas rather than gross acres) to provide for densities that better match the intent of the zone.

Letter No. 72 Krigsman, Irwin

Response to Comment 1: Don't Upzone Park and Ride, Make Part of Illahee Preserve

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The property is included in the Preferred Alternative as Mixed Use.

Letter No. 73 Krigsman, Judith (8/29/06; Waaga Way)

Response to Comment 1: Keep Land North of Waaga Way Rural

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Parks Zoning is a Good Idea

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 74 Krigsman, Judith (8/29/06; Senior Housing)

Response to Comment 1: Concern over Senior Housing is Overblown

The Comprehensive Plan is a 20-Year Plan. As Baby Boomers age and as housing needs change, it is likely that senior housing will become more and more important.

Letter No. 75 Krigsman, Judith (9/20/06; Kitsap Transit)

Response to Comment 1: Authority for Kitsap Transit Rezone

Kitsap Transit provided a timely Land Use Reclassification Request that met the criteria to be considered. WSDOT provided a letter dated April 4, 2006 indicating their agreement that a reclassification/rezone could be considered if it allowed the park-and-ride function to continue:

“Please accept this letter as authorization from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) as owner of the real property that is the subject of the attached Land Use Reclassification Request to request a zoning change for the McWilliams Park and Ride Lot property. This authority is effective only so long as the zoning change does not impact the current use of the property.

A property exchange is contemplated so that KT [Kitsap Transit] will ultimately own the existing park and ride lot site and WSDOT will own the relocated park and ride lot site.”

The letter continued with contact information, and was signed by Gerald L. Gallinger, Director, Real Estate Services, Washington State Department of Transportation. The land use reclassification process is described in DEIS Appendix E.

Response to Comment 2: WSDOT Not Surplusing Property

Please see Response to Comment 1 above.

Response to Comment 3: Application Should Be Withdrawn

Please see Response to Comment 1 above.

Letter No. 76 Krigsman, Judith (9/20/06; Subject Not Stated)

Response to Comment 1: Alternative Two Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. It appears the commenter is potentially referring to Central Valley. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Letter No. 77 Krigsman, Judith (10/30/06; Golf Course)

Response to Comment 1: Avoid Residential Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the Rolling Hills Golf Course as Urban Reserve (1 du/ 10 acres). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Letter No. 78 Kuhlman, Mark

Response to Comment 1: Conrad Hanson Redesignation Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative maintains the Industrial classification. Planning Commission and BOCC discussions indicated concerns that the property is surrounded on three sides by Industrial zoning. Based on County experience in other locations, maintaining compatibility between industrial and residential uses can be difficult when abutting on only one side, let alone three.

Response to Comment 2: Jean Sherrard Redesignation Request

Please see Response to Comment 2.

Response to Comment 3: Urban Restricted Density

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the density range of 1-5 dwelling units per acre similar to Alternative 1. It also adjusts density to be calculated based on gross acres minus critical areas. This is similar to the Alternative 2 approach, but it does not exclude buffers from the density calculation. It also does not exclude roads or stormwater facilities.

Letter No. 79 Larabee, Kent

Response to Comment 1: Massive Raceway is a Bad Idea for the Peninsula

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 80 Larson, Bruce D.

Response to Comment 1: Opposed to NASCAR Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 81 Lindsey, Gary (9/21/06)

Response to Comment 1: Urban Restricted Density

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the density range of 1-5 dwelling units per acre similar to Alternative 1. It also adjusts density to be calculated based on gross acres minus critical areas. This is similar to the Alternative 2 approach, except Alternative 2 does not exclude buffers from the density calculation and retains the upper limit of Urban Restricted to be 5 du/ac.

Letter No. 82 Lindsey, Gary (10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Urban Restricted Density

Please see Response to Letter No. 81 Comment 1, Gary Lindsey.

Letter No. 83 Lytle, Jean

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 84 McLemore, Janice

Response to Comment 1: Please Include Statement at Hearings

The comment is noted, and the letter is part of the Hearing Record and this FEIS.

Response to Comment 2: NASCAR Threatens Environment and Rural Lifestyle

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 85 Mentor, Joe

Response to Comment 1: Support Alternative 2 but Zoning Not Always Reflective of Constraints

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. During upcoming phases of its code update, the County intends to address master plan regulations that would allow multiple properties in a single ownership to be planned together, as promoted by the cited policies.

Response to Comment 2: Support Wastewater Service Policies; Need to Clarify Service Providers and Ability to Extend Sewer

The promotion of "... Kitsap County as an agency for long-term monitoring and maintenance of alternative sanitary sewer systems" does not exclude the possibility of other special district service providers from being qualified to support alternative technologies.

The Capital Facilities Plan and DEIS Section 3.3 note the current and planned capacity of the Central Kitsap Treatment Plant. It is sized (based on current and planned improvements) to meet levels of growth similar to Alternative 2 and the Preferred Plan. Where feasible extension of sewer service to the regional system is highly appropriate.

The County has made a high priority of implementing goals and policies addressing alternative wastewater technologies as stated in Chapter 18 of the (Draft and) Preferred Plan.

Response to Comment 3: DEIS Understates Impacts of Alternative 1

The DEIS indicates for Alternative 1 in the Land Use Patterns section that "...development within UGAs may increase pressures for future urban development upon bordering rural lands, particularly in rural land adjacent to the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and Port Orchard UGAs because capacity in these UGAs would be considerably lower than that needed to accommodate targeted growth." Similar analysis is provided in Section 3.2.3 Population, Housing, and Employment.

The purpose of the EIS is to discuss probable adverse environmental impacts, and not necessarily to describe beneficial impacts (WAC 197-11-402(1)). The DEIS does note the areas of consistency and inconsistency with plans and policies and growth demands.

The Land Use Reclassification Request analysis in DEIS Appendix E notes the presence of several mapped critical areas and does not provide a detailed site-specific analysis. In terms of wetland mapping, it is based on existing available information. However, critical area regulations are applied based on site-specific conditions even if shown to a greater extent on inventory maps. The submitted maps are part of the record of the 10-Year Update.

Response to Comment 4: Regulations should Authorize Master Planning and Not Require TDR to Transfer Density

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Comment 1 above.

Response to Comment 5: Disagree with Density Calculation Changes

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Historically, the density range for the Urban Restricted zone was calculated at 1-5 dwelling units per acre with the low number based upon net acreage and the high based on gross acreage. For example, a 20-acre property with all but 5 acres constrained by critical areas could develop between 5 (net) and 100 (gross) dwelling units. The language of the Comprehensive Plan and County Code contradicted this interpretation. These documents indicate that the density for each project was to be based upon the property's constraints taking into account critical area impacts. This indicates that both the low and high numbers should be based upon net acreage after the removal of critical areas. The Preferred Alternative proposes the Urban Restricted zone at 1-5 du/ac similar to Alternative 1, rather than the Alternative 2 density range of 1-4 du/ac. The regulations would alter the calculation of density (gross acres minus critical areas rather than gross acres) to provide for densities that better match the intent of the zone.

Response to Comment 6: Lot Aggregation

The lot combination provisions for non-conforming lots in common ownership located in Volume III: Proposed Regulations only apply to the Suquamish and Manchester Rural Villages. These provisions were previously approved by specific sub-area plans for each area in 2000 and 2002. Volume III relocates the text to a different section of Code and amends the Manchester requirements based upon citizen testimony and the recommendation of the Manchester Community Council.

Response to Comment 7: Design Guidelines

Draft Volume III, Appendix C, contained draft design guidelines for the Silverdale downtown vicinity. The note on the top of the guidelines stated: "These draft design guidelines for the downtown Silverdale area are referenced in the Draft EIS. These draft guidelines are currently being developed and reviewed by the stakeholder committee. As these guidelines are not a requirement of the 10-Year Update, they may be adopted concurrent with the 10-Year Update or at a later date." At this time it is expected that the design guidelines will be adopted separately from the 10-Year Update and that use of the draft standards would be voluntary at this time.

Response to Comment 8: General Support for Plan Update, With Some Reconsiderations Needed

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Responses to Comments 1 to 7 above.

Letter No. 86 Munie, N. Jean

Response to Comment 1: Keep Two Properties as Highway Tourist Commercial

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The property is included in the Preferred Alternative as Highway Tourist Commercial. Please note that the Mixed Use Classification proposed along SR-303 allows most Highway Tourist Commercial uses by administrative conditional use permit while still including incentives for higher density residential uses.

Letter No. 87 Palmer, Bill (for Derek Jaros)

Response to Comment 1: Reclass Request in Rocky Point, Make Urban Low

Although the Rocky Point Park LLC request was not eligible for individual review in the 10-Year Update, the property was included into the Preferred Alternative (and Alternative 2) West Bremerton UGA as Urban Low as part of an areawide look at densities and UGA boundaries.

Letter No. 88 Paulson, Jenny

Response to Comment 1: Don't Change Rules in SKIA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 89 Peterson, Dave

Response to Comment 1: Allow Multifamily and Condominiums on First Floor in Old Town Silverdale

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the Old Town area as neighborhood commercial, with a revised density range for mixed use development of 10-30 DU/acre. The proposed regulations in Volume III allow a mix of commercial and residential uses on ground floors, but commercial uses would need to be accommodated on some portion of the site.

Letter No. 90 Slaninka, Laurel

Response to Comment 1: Support Silverdale Alternative 2A, Include Property

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The property is included in the Preferred Alternative.

Letter No. 91 Smidt, Colleen

Response to Comment 1: Support NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 92 Smith, John W.

Response to Comment 1: Don't Change the Rules for NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 93 Stasny, John & Maggie

Response to Comment 1: Kitsap is Not the Place for NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 94 Stodden, Nancy K.

Response to Comment 1: Include Properties as Urban Low

Parcel 242501-3-041-2003 is designated as Urban Low in the Preferred Alternative, which allows between 4 and 9 units per acre.

The Parcel 292401-005-2007 is shown as having no “active account” on the Assessor Website. Please see maps in Chapter 2 of the Preferred Alternative for the land use designation for this second parcel.

Letter No. 95 Thorne, Marge

Response to Comment 1: Support Silverdale Alternative 1

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the subject property has the same Urban Low classification in Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and the Preferred Alternative.

Letter No. 96 Thorpe & Associates

Response to Comment 1: Support for Warden Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the property as Mixed Use, rather than Urban High Residential.

Response to Comment 2: Higher Density Appropriate

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Consistency Matrix Submitted

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The matrix is part of the record.

Please note that the County's review of reclassification requests in relation to County review criteria is included in Appendix E of the DEIS.

Response to Comment 4: Commenter's Qualifications

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 97 Trainer, Jim

Response to Comment 1: Leave Trees – Economic Benefits

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see DEIS section 3.1.4 regarding plants and wildlife including mitigation measures addressing vegetation retention. Please also see the Natural Systems chapter of Volume I, which includes goals and policies on similar vegetation retention topics.

Letter No. 98 Trainer, Jim

Response to Comment 1: Submittal of "Trees are Good for Business"

The submittal is part of the FEIS record. Please note the Comprehensive Plan policies promote tree/vegetation retention through techniques including low impact development.

Letter No. 99 Trygstad, Julie

Response to Comment 1: Oppose the Speedway

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 100 Warden, Terri

Response to Comment 1: Agree with Planning Commission Recommendation for Mixed Use

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the property as Mixed Use, rather than Urban High Residential.

Response to Comment 2: Property Features and Future Plans

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Future mixed use development and any further site improvements will need to conform to Kitsap County regulations. Please see Volume III for the new Mixed Use Zone regulations. Many of the uses will require an Administrative Conditional Use Permit.

Response to Comment 3: Summary

Please see Responses to Comment 1 and 2.

5.2.3. South Kitsap

Table 5.2-3 lists citizen, business and property owner comment letters that pertain to South Kitsap County (as defined by Commissioner Districts) received during the public comment period. The agency letters appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment.

Table 5.2-3. South Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
101	Archer, Margaret	Gordon, Thomas, Honeywell, et al. for Manke Lumber	10/23/2006
102	Brown, William and Lila		9/17/2006
103	Cain, Ron		9/20/2006
104	Cain, Ron		9/27/2006
105	Chapman, William	Preston Gates & Ellis for Great Western Sports	10/30/2006
106	Chase, Mitchell et al.		10/26/2006
107	Colburn, Mary		9/21/2006
108	Colburn, Mary		10/30/2006
109	Cousins, Harvey, Mr and Mrs.		9/21/2006
110	Danison, Richard		10/22/2006
111	Deppe, Fred		10/27/2006
112	Dow, Errol		9/21/2006
113	Eger, Richard B.		10/2/2006
114	Esau, Bert and Sharon		9/18/2006
115	Fischer, Linda L.		10/30/2006
116	Flaherty, Rick	Leader International Corporation	9/22/2006
117	Forester, Karma		9/3/2006
118	Forester, Karma		9/5/2006
119	Garland, Barry		10/23/2006

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
120	Garland, Patricia		10/26/2006
121	Gingerich, Michael S.		9/19/2006
122	Green, Karen		10/26/2006
123	Guroi, Kamuron		10/25/2006
124	Gustavson, Michael		10/20/2006
125	Gustavson, Michael		10/23/2006
126	Hall, Charles and Alice		10/26/2006
127	Hansen, Joyce		10/30/2006
128	Harless, Jerry		10/27/2006
129	Hawkins, Brian		10/23/2006
130	Hawkins, Grace and Johnson, Earl		10/23/2006
132	Helms, James J, Skinner, Virginia H.		9/20/2006
133	Heytvelt, Jim		9/20/2006
134	Horovitz, Daniel		9/21/2006
135	Hower, Chuck		10/22/2006
136	Jacobson, Gordon		10/24/2006
137	Kerkes, Gary		10/27/2006
138	Kiesel, Pam		10/30/2006
139	Lynch, Grant	Great Western Sports	10/30/2006
140	McCuddin, Mike		9/21/2006
141	McFadden, Michele	Michele McFadden Law Office	9/21/2006
142	McFaddon, Michele	Michele McFadden Law Office	10/23/2006
143	Minear, Karen		10/27/2006
144	Mischel, Jerry and Judith		9/20/2006
145	Mischel, Jerry and Judith		10/30/2006
146	Mischel, Ken		10/30/2006
147	Nordgren, John		10/23/2006
148	Palmer, Bill		9/18/2006
149	Paquette, Phillip E. Jr.		9/21/2006
150	Parker, Martha M.		10/22/2006
151	Penovich, Linda		9/20/2006

Comments and Responses

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
152	Plummer, Grant & Karen		10/22/2006
153	Prentice, Janet		9/28/2006
154	Ramsey, Diane		9/14/2006
155	Randall, Cynthia		10/22/2006
156	Reeves, Connie		9/19/2006
157	Reid, Rod	Alpine Evergreen Company, Inc.	9/21/2006
158	Row, Donald and Romelia		9/20/2006
159	Rutkowski, Christine		10/24/2006
160	Sherrard, Gene		9/21/2006
161	Simpson, Dennis		10/30/2006
162	Skrobot, Doug	McCormick Land Company	9/18/2006
163	Spady, Jay		10/30/2006
164	Stodden, Helen K.	The Stodden Trust	9/8/2006
165	Struck, Phil	Parametrix	9/21/2006
166	Trudeau, Debra D'Andrea		9/27/2006
167	Valentino, Mike		9/27/2006
168	Valentino, Mike		10/23/2006
169	Wilson, Michael		10/23/2006
170	Wright, Debbie		9/13/2006
171	Wrothwell, Ruthie		10/23/2006

Letter No. 101 Archer, Margaret

Response to Comment 1: Support RWIP as a Starting Point with Additional Efforts for Wooded Shoreline

The comments regarding the RWIP as a starting point for a meaningful and mutually beneficial improvement program are noted. Forestry Activities are considered an allowable use within the Open Space Tracts of the RWIP. Please refer to Volume III. The comments regarding the proposal for the further study of wooded shoreline preservation program are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Discussion of History, Context & Impacts of Rural Policies

The comments regarding the RWIP history and the impacts of the Interim Rural Forest designation has had upon rural property owners are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Supporting RWIP as a Starting Point

The comments of support regarding the adoption of the RWIP as a starting point in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: CPSGMHB Decisions Regarding Rural Incentive Programs

The comments regarding the CPSGMHB decisions related to Kitsap County and the comments regarding the RWIP are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: CPSGMHB Decisions Regarding Rural Densities

The comments regarding the CPSGMHB decisions related to other jurisdictions and the comments regarding RWIP density of one unit per five acres are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Impacts of the RWIP

The comments regarding the impacts of not including a RWIP are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the RWIP has been included in the Preferred Alternative as described in FEIS Chapter 2 and in Volume III.

Letter No. 102 Brown, William and Lila

Response to Comment 1: Request Approval of Reclass Request

The Land Use Reclassification Request pertains to Port Orchard/South Kitsap and request #81 as numbered in DEIS Appendix E. This request was studied in Alternatives 2 and 3 of the DEIS as Industrial. The Preferred Alternative also includes this request.

Letter No. 103 Cain, Ron (9/17/06)

Response to Comment 1: Request Approval of Reclass Request

The Land Use Reclassification Request pertains to ULID#6 and request #66 as numbered in DEIS Appendix E. This request was studied in Alternative 3 of the DEIS. The Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2 do not include this request. With these alternatives, the UGA essentially meets the population target assigned in the Countywide Planning Policies (within less than 1% at minimum densities).

Letter No. 104 Cain, Ron (9/20/06)

Response to Comment 1: Map Submittal showing Property

The submittal is part of the FEIS record. Please see Response to Letter No. 103 Comment 1, Ron Cain.

Letter No. 105 Chapman, William

Response to Comment 1: Behalf of Great Western Sports; Support Alternative 2

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 2: IMPRA Steps

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 3: Submittal of Land Use Reclassification Similar to Other Properties

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Review of Land Use Reclassification Requests appear in Appendix E of the DEIS.

Response to Comment 4: Retain Full Policy LU-105 Regarding Signs

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the same language regarding signage as the Draft. However the overall policy pre-ambule is modified to clarify that the County will review and consider rather than review and approve a Type IV application to emphasize the discretionary nature of considering projects through the IMPRA process.

Letter No. 106 Chase Mitchell et al.

Response to Comment 1: Oppose the NASCAR Track

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 107 Colburn, Mary (9/21/06)

Response to Comment 1: Oppose SKIA Rezoning and Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 108 Colburn, Mary (10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Do Not Rezone SKIA for Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 2: Do Not Include Johnson Creek in UGA

The Poulsbo UGA is not expanded in the Preferred Alternative. Please see Response to Letter No. 19 Comment 1, Julie Bergum.

Response to Comment 3: Remove Delilah Request off Baby Doll Road

The Preferred Alternative excludes several properties including those owned by Delilah Rene in northeast Port Orchard.

Letter No. 109 Cousins, Harvey, Mr. and Mrs.

Response to Comment 1: Support for Rezone Request

The comments regarding the inclusion and commercial designation of your parcel located at 6200 Glenwood Road SW, the parcel is proposed within the Urban Growth Area as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Inclusion of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments regarding the inclusion and commercial designation of your parcel located at 855 Sedgwick Road, the parcel is proposed within the Urban Growth Area as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 3: Desire to Contribute to Business Growth of Port Orchard

The comments regarding the desires to contribute to the business growth of the Port Orchard area and these comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 110 Danison, Richard

Response to Comment 1: Want EIS Before Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The 10-Year Update EIS (Volume II) addresses the impacts of expanding the SKIA UGA at a programmatic level reviewing general zoning categories. A programmatic EIS is appropriate for a non-project action. Consistent with SEPA phased review allowances, site-specific environmental review of a specific proposal is to be completed before any additional legislative actions and before any urban uses

could occur. The cost of the site-specific environmental review is to be borne by the project proponent rather than the County. The provisions of the IMPRA require SEPA review as part of the public review process for a master plan and development agreement. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 111 Depee, Fred

Response to Comment 1: Exclusion of Rene Properties

The comments and materials regarding the exclusion of parcels from the Baby Doll Road area of the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that parcels owned by Ms. Rene, the Bidwells, and the Brose family have been removed from the Urban Growth Area and remain Rural Residential. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No.112 Dow, Errol

Response to Comment 1: South Kitsap CAG

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Alternatives 2 and 3 Should Be Reviewed by BOCC and State

Both Alternatives 2 and 3 were studied in the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update, and the draft plan, EIS, and development regulation documents were provided to the BOCC and State agencies. The Preferred Alternative is similar to Alternative 2.

Letter No.113 Eger, Richard B.

Response to Comment 1: Request Inclusion in SKIA UGA as Light Industrial

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Consistent with its comprehensive plan amendment regulations, the County considered private land use reclassification requests from property owners of all parcel sizes in developing land use alternatives considered in the 10-Year Update. A request for the subject property was not received by the April 10, 2006 deadline and not studied in the EIS or Plan alternatives. In the future, the property owner may submit a site-specific land use classification request in accordance with County annual plan amendment procedures.

Letter No. 114 Esau, Bert and Sharon

Response to Comment 1: Request Approval of Reclass Request

The Land Use Reclassification Request pertains to ULID#6 and request #68 as numbered in DEIS Appendix E. This request was studied in Alternative 3 of the DEIS. The Preferred Alternative and Alternative 2 do not include this request. With these alternatives, the UGA essentially meets

the population target assigned in the Countywide Planning Policies (within less than 1% at minimum densities).

Letter No. 115 Fischer, Linda L.

Response to Comment 1: Letter to Governor

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: EIS for NASCAR

Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison, and please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 3: Jobs – Attract Another Business

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Infrastructure

Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison, and please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 5: Need Responsive Government; Oppose Zoning Until EIS Prepared

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison, and please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 116 Flaherty, Rick

Response to Comment 1: Support Alternative 2 SKIA Proposal

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 117 Forester, Karma

Response to Comment 1: Support for Rezone Request

The comments and support regarding the adoption of the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update, and as it relates to your parcel on Baker Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 118 Forester, Karma

Response to Comment 1: Support for Rezone Request

The comments and support regarding the adoption of the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update, and as it relates to your parcel on Baker Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 119 Garland, Barry

Response to Comment 1: Why Public Financing for NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Environment

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton regarding a project level SEPA review prior to further County legislative decisions.

Response to Comment 3: Infrastructure Support by Taxpayers

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton regarding project level capital plans prior to further County legislative decisions.

Response to Comment 4: Security and Airport

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton regarding a project level SEPA review prior to further County legislative decisions.

Response to Comment 5: Political Involvement

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Unlikely to Schedule Many Races

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 7: Contribution to Track, Hostage in the Future

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 120 Garland, Patricia

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Track and Noise

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Hood Canal is Environmentally Sensitive

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton regarding a project level SEPA review prior to further County legislative decisions.

Response to Comment 3: Out of State Owners

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Oil and Gasoline Dependence

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Infrastructure

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton regarding project level capital plans prior to further County legislative decisions.

Letter No. 121 Gingerich, Michael S.

Response to Comment 6: Don't Cram Houses Together; Have Yards

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please note that GMA requires that the County provide for a variety of housing choices, and to provide for parks and recreation facilities. The County intends to regularly review development regulations to consider balancing of GMA goals and the County vision and policies in developing standards for lot sizes, setbacks, etc.

Letter No. 122 Green, Karen

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 123 Gurol, Kamuron

Response to Comment 1: Support Volume III Amendments for Manchester

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative incorporates the Manchester related regulations, including those stated in the Volume III Errata dated September 2006.

Letter No. 124 Gustavson, Michael (10/10/06)

Response to Comment 1: Rush to Prepare Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Plan Volumes address all required GMA and SEPA topics, and they were prepared with extensive public review given the 1-year timeframe. See FEIS Appendix A.

Response to Comment 2: Delete Lots Facing Collins Road from Port Orchard UGA

Due to citizen input and environmental constraints, the Preferred Alternative excludes several properties including those owned by Delilah Rene in northeast Port Orchard. The population is reallocated to “centers” in Port Orchard (e.g. along Bethel Road) as promoted in Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan policies.

Response to Comment 3: Unfunded Infrastructure Cost

Regarding services, the DEIS (Volume II) identified service needs for a 20-year period, and the Volume I Capital Facilities Plan identified specific projects and funding sources to meet demand for the required 6-year period. Similar to the DEIS, beyond the required 6-year period, the Transportation analysis in FEIS section 3.2.6 also describes estimated projects, costs, and funding sources for a 20-year period.

Response to Comment 4: Parcels Designated Rural Have Services

Please see Letter No. 54 Responses to Comment 1 to 3, Ron and Lillian Ross.

Response to Comment 5: TDR Program

TDRs provide an additional alternative to rural development that allows rural property owners to see financial benefit from their property while furthering the County’s UGA density goals (reasonable measure). Several amendments were made to the proposed regulations as a result of Planning Commission review describing the restoration of development rights. The TDR regulations will be monitored and if course corrections are necessary, they can be made at that time.

Response to Comment 6: Reasonable Measures and UGA Sizing

The Preferred Alternative, similar to Alternative 2, is within five percent of the CPP targets. Given the ability to institute UGAMAs to allocate banked population, the density ranges of the zones that are flexible to market needs, the ability to annually monitor land capacity as recommended in plan policies, together with annual and period comprehensive plan amendment opportunities, the County will have the ability to respond to expected growth.

Response to Comment 7: Increase in Home Cost

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 8: Subsidizing First Homebuyer Homes

Policy HS-27 identifies the potential need to “study the feasibility and cost-effectiveness of providing housing subsidies to targeted groups of first time homeowners, such as public safety workers (police, fire and medical) and teachers whose presence in the local community serves a vital public purpose.” Targeting public safety and education providers allows these persons to live near the communities they serve in Kitsap. However, policy HS-26 generally indicates the County would “study the feasibility of establishing a low-interest loan program or other financial assistance programs conducive to providing first-time homebuyers an opportunity to achieve home ownership.” This latter policy applies to any first-time homebuyers.

Response to Comment 9: Artificial High Prices for Future

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The ability of each Alternative to supply projected housing needs across the range of incomes is addressed in DEIS/FEIS Section 3.2.3. The Preferred Alternative, similar to Alternative 2, provides for greater housing variety to promote affordability to a range of economic segments.

Response to Comment 10: Nonconforming Homes

The Preferred Alternative proposes to expand UGAs by about 33%. It would provide housing to meet the projected demand of growth. The Plan can be amended as appropriate (see Response to Comment 6). Further, homes on lawfully created lots, even where lots are smaller than that allowed by zoning may be developed in accordance with County Regulations.

Letter No. 125 Gustavson, Michael (10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Rush to Prepare Comprehensive Plan

Please see Response to Letter No. 124 Comment 1, Michael Gustavson.

Response to Comment 2: Delete Lots Facing Collins Road from Port Orchard UGA

Please see Response to Letter No. 124 Comment 2, Michael Gustavson.

Response to Comment 3: Reasonable Measures and UGA Sizing

Please see Response to Letter No. 124 Comment 6, Michael Gustavson.

Response to Comment 4: Downzoning Waaga Way

See Responses to Letter No. 54 Comment 1 to 3 and 5, Ron and Lillian Ross.

Response to Comment 5: TDR

Please see Response Letter No. 124 to Comment 5, Michael Gustavson.

Response to Comment 6: Home Costs

Please see Responses to Letter No. 124 Comment 7 to 9, Michael Gustavson.

Response to Comment 7: Nonconforming Homes

Please see Response to Letter No. 124 Comment 10, Michael Gustavson.

Letter No. 126 Hall, Charles and Alice

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 127 Hansen, Joyce

Response to Comment 1: Need Firm Commitment to Protect Natural Resources

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see the Natural Systems chapter of the proposed plan in Volume I.

Response to Comment 2: Consider No Net Loss of Critical Values and Functions

No net loss of critical area functions and values is included in Natural Systems Chapter policies for wetlands.

Response to Comment 3: Why Inevitable Loss of Wetlands and Wildlife

All Alternatives would result in some impact to the Natural Environment, including the No Action. (See Response to Letter No. 9 Comment 19, the Suquamish Tribe.) GMA requires the County to balance goals for accommodating growth and protecting critical areas. On an area-specific basis, the County applies regulations to achieve no net loss of critical areas. Countywide efforts to prepare low impact development regulations, and update shoreline and stormwater regulations can help to further reduce impacts.

Letter No. 128 Harless, Jerry

Response to Comment 1: Land Capacity, Buildable Lands

The County has conducted its 10-Year Update in accordance with RCW 36.70A.110. Its land capacity analysis for the 10-Year Update has excluded the sewer factor consistent with the CPSGMHB decision regarding the Kingston UGA. The County has also proposed additional reasonable measures with its 10-Year Update per Section 2.3 of the Land Use Element and DEIS Appendix H (FEIS Appendix C).

The County has been coordinating with cities and others to begin the Buildable Lands Report due in 2007 to meet RCW 36.70A.215.

Letter No. 129 Harless, Jerry

Response to Comment 1: Reference to Hearings Board and Court Decisions

The Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update is based upon *1000 Friends v. Kitsap County*, CPSGMHB Case No. 04-3-0031c, requiring the County to take appropriate legislative action to comply with the review and revision requirements of RCW 36.70A.130(3) for its UGA designations and permitted urban densities by December 31, 2006.

The Thurston County Superior Court decision has been appealed.

Response to Comment 2: Commend Effort to Create Content and Actively Involve the Community

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Concerns with Substantive Content But Recognize Quantity and Quality of Work

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Responses to specific concerns identified in the letter are provided below.

Response to Comment 4: Kingston Remand Decisions and Two New Errors

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Responses to specific concerns identified in the letter are provided below.

Response to Comment 5: Included Research with Letter

The comments are noted. The research documents are part of the FEIS record.

Response to Comment 6: Critique of Draft Plan and EIS

The summary of the Kingston CPSGMHB decision is noted. The summary of this decision was also included on DEIS page 2-15 as well as DEIS Appendix B. As part of the 10-Year Update:

- The Kingston UGA expansion was considered cumulatively with, and incorporated into, the overall 10-Year Update;
- The Kingston UGA was analyzed with different density assumptions in the DEIS Alternatives, and as part of the Preferred Alternative, accommodates its 2005-2025 growth allocation;
- The 10-Year Update includes new and augmented reasonable measures. Those applying to Kingston include (see DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C):
 - 9-lot administrative short plat allowances
 - Minimum densities
 - Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program
 - Policies (and regulations—see Response to Comment 10 below) that: a) support targeted utility investment in sewer and allow for alternative sanitary sewer systems; b) promote regional stormwater facilities in unincorporated UGAs; and c) promote low impact development.
 - Removal of pre-planning process to encourage sewer connection
 - Consolidated Comprehensive Plan categories for simpler rezones
 - Countywide SEPA threshold increases
 - Increased building heights
 - Adopt allowances for density bonuses in policies
 - Adopt policies addressing and promoting reasonable measures

- The Land Capacity Analysis was modified to exclude the sewer factor and the DEIS reviewed each alternative with and without the sewer factor (see DEIS Appendix B as well as DEIS Chapter 2 page 2-20 and the impact analysis of DEIS Section 3.2.3).
- The DEIS (Volume II) identified capital facility needs for a 20-year period and the Volume I Capital Facilities Plan (Appendix A) identified specific projects and funding sources to meet demand for the required 6-year period.

Response to Comment 7: Ten-Year Update

The comment that the 10-Year Update, when adopted, will satisfy the GMA requirement for a countywide review and evaluation of UGAs every 10 years is noted.

Response to Comment 8: Accommodate Full 20-Year Growth Allocation

Population allocations in the Countywide Planning Policies are based on the mid-range State Office of Financial Management projections. They were allocated based on a multi-jurisdictional process and *preceded* the development of land use alternatives. The benefit of the 10-Year Update process has been to cumulatively consider the 20-year growth projections for the County and to review where the population allocations can be accommodated by land use patterns incorporating reasonable measures and UGA expansions, and where the allocations are more difficult to achieve given constraints of critical areas and pre-existing development patterns.

The Preferred Alternative (and Alternative 2) comes within 5% of the Countywide Planning Policy population allocations – still within the OFM population range (between low and medium projections). Accommodating the proposed population allocations for the Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton has proven difficult because the opportunities for upzoning and expansion to accommodate this population are limited due to critical area constraints and existing development patterns. Nevertheless, as all three UGAs about the City of Bremerton, the remaining population can be sensibly designated through an UGAMA process or redistributed to other urban areas within the County. This will afford the City additional control over where to accommodate the additional population to best fit its future needs.

The City of Bremerton supports this approach. In a letter dated October 19, 2006 (FEIS Letter No. 1): the City stated: “We support the County’s proposal to use population banking as a method to allocate anticipated growth that can not be fully accommodated in Central Kitsap. Some or all of this excess population can be reallocated to Center districts in the City of Bremerton where there is ample capacity.” Furthermore, the Washington State Department of Community Development in its letter dated October 20, 2006 indicates that population banking policies provide “a reasonable direction for reallocating population targets.”

Response to Comment 9: Timely Implementation

The County’s approach to bank population limits UGA expansions and phases growth pending the outcome of a high-priority process to develop the UGAMAs with the cities. Chapter 18, Implementation, gives a high priority to the UGAMA process and added policies (see Response

to Letter No 1 Comment 3, City of Bremerton) further specify that these are to occur in the 2007-08 period.

Response to Comment 10: Reasonable Measures

The majority of the reasonable measures cited in Land Use Chapter 2.3.3 have implementing code that supports them in Volume III of the 10-Year Update, *including but not limited to*: consolidated Comprehensive Plan categories and implementing area zoning, increased residential densities in commercial zones, minimum residential densities, increased residential and commercial building heights, new Mixed Use Zone, pre-planning removal, SEPA exemptions, and TDR regulations.

The commenter's statement regarding a lack of minimum density provisions is not accurate. Volume III, Section 17.382.060 and 070 identify minimum densities for each residential and commercial zone.

Policies in the Land Use Element of Volume I (see Goal 5 and associated policies) support alternative sewer technologies and provision of sewer with new growth. To respond to the concern about enforcing sewer hook-up policies, the Preferred Alternative incorporates the following additional code:

Add new footnote #48 to the header row of 17.381.040.A and 17.381.040.B for the UCR, UL, UM and UH, NC, UVC, UTC, HTC, RC and MU zones.

Footnote #48

Within Urban Growth Areas, all new residential subdivisions, single-family or multi-family developments are required to provide an urban level of sanitary sewer service for all proposed dwelling units.

Response to Comment 11: Reasonable Measures and UGA Expansion

DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C identifies the adopted and proposed reasonable measures considered in the 10-Year Update.

For those reasonable measures already adopted, the analysis reviews their potential effectiveness based on the County's experience to date: "The seven quantifiable measures examined in this analysis are likely to account for somewhere in the range of 1%-5% of the forecast 20-year population growth, depending in large part on local real estate market conditions. However, assuming existing development trends and market conditions remain relatively static, they are unlikely to accommodate a significant amount of future 'infill' development relative to the total 20-year forecast growth for all the unincorporated UGAs. In addition, their relative acceptance by developers and the real estate market is likely to vary by UGA." (DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C, Personius report) Countywide, unincorporated UGAs are within 5% of population allocations. This 5% may account for reasonable measures.

In addition, new recommended measures were based on a review of effective measures in other communities (see pages 7 and 8 of the Personius report in DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C),

and the majority of the new measures are implemented by new code provisions as described in Response to Comment 10 and illustrated in Volume III. Those reasonable measures that included upzones and the new Mixed Use zone are part of the land capacity analysis of the alternatives, including the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 12: Residential Capacity

Please see Response to Letter No. 9 Comment 3, Suquamish Tribe.

Response to Comment 13: Rural Wooded Program

The possibility of increasing the attractiveness of rural areas is a concern described in the DEIS Section 3.2.2. However, in order to proceed cautiously, the RWIP is a pilot program and would not apply to the full Rural Wooded properties at this time. Please also see Response to Letter No. 10 Comment 19, Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development. In addition, the TDR sending areas include those designated Rural Wooded (see Volume III).

Response to Comment 14: Land Capacity Analysis

The County has applied its land capacity analysis to all alternatives studied in the EIS.

The commenter's statement that the Draft Plan removed the sewer reduction factor for Alternatives 2 and 3 and not for Alternative 1 is inaccurate. The DEIS reviewed all three alternatives with and without the sewer reduction factor, including Alternative 1. See DEIS Appendix B as well as DEIS Chapter 2 page 2-20 and the impact analysis of Section 3.2.3.

Response to Comment 15: Minimum Density Change

Please see Response to Letter No. 9 Comment 3, Suquamish Tribe.

Response to Comment 16: Land Capacity Densities Should Be Higher

The use of the minimum density is a conservative estimate and is also the minimum density that the County can require. While preliminary results for the 2000-2005 period are showing a positive trend in Urban Low Residential plats, the results are not universally found in all UGAs. The County is planning for the minimum urban density it can require but is also providing for more housing densities and choices than the 1998 Plan.

The County allows higher densities in commercial and mixed use zones (e.g. minimum 10 du/ac) which are applied typically along major routes and in centers where transit service is available or more readily provided. In addition, Kitsap Transit has planned for all UGA lands (as shown in the Preferred Alternative) to be in its primary service area.

The County is retaining a density range in Urban Low of 4-9 dwelling units per acre to allow for flexibility in housing types, prices, and allow for infrastructure costs to be spread as necessary.

Response to Comment 17: Capacity Difference Due to Change in Density

DEIS Alternatives 1 and 3 were studied with a minimum 5 du/ac while Alternative 2 proposed 4 du/ac. To determine, within existing UGA boundaries, the difference between Alternative 1 and 2, DEIS Table 3.2-88 shows the effect of the new Alternative 2 density within December 2005 UGA Boundaries. Table 3.2-88 identifies the capacity reductions between Alternatives 1 and 2 due to the single-family density shift from 5 du/ac to 4 du/ac within existing UGA boundaries. This is compared with the effectiveness of increased densities (e.g., the Mixed Use zone or other rezones). To promote efficient development in UGAs, a list of additional reasonable measures that are proposed for new application in the 10-Year Update are summarized in the table. Other new reasonable measures have not yet been quantified but are shown on the chart to indicate that in addition to the up-zoning and mixed use zoning other measures would also apply.

In addition, land capacity results were shown in several ways in the documentation: 1) in comparing land capacity results for population and housing associated with each alternative in DEIS Chapter 2, Section 3.2.3, and Appendix D; 2) in reporting buildable acres in DEIS Section 3.2.2 for each alternative; and 3) providing maps in Section 3.2.2 showing visually the gross buildable acres for each alternative. The land capacity methods followed the approved Updated Land Capacity Analysis methods that have been published for some time (e.g. see MyKitsap.org), except that in response to the CPSGMHB decision regarding the Kingston Sub-Area Plan, the sewer reduction factor was removed.

FEIS Appendix B contains the summary buildable lands calculations for reference for the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 18: Density and UGA Sizing

The County's change in minimum densities meets GMA requirements for an urban density. Please see Response to Comment 17 above in this letter, as well as Response to Letter No. 9 Comment 3, Suquamish Tribe.

Response to Comment 19: Capital Facilities Inventory

The inventory of capital facilities is found in Volume I Appendix A and in DEIS Section 3.3. The level of detail is commensurate with the level of detail in the 1998/99 Capital Facilities Plan found compliant with GMA. The new Capital Facilities Plan Update has involved an extensive coordination effort to obtain copies of service provider capital facilities plans, as well as to provide the service providers with population numbers, maps and individual meetings to convey the growth and land use proposed. Service providers have been provided information with which they can assess the effect on their existing facilities, capital plans and needs, and these service providers in turn have provided to the County their planned improvements for inclusion in the Capital Facilities Plan.

At a Countywide scale, the DEIS provides a wastewater map showing service areas, treatment plants, and pump stations. The County prepared UGA level maps with available information on location of sewer lines at the time the alternatives were developed in May/June 2006 and those were available for public review at the May 2006 open houses and reviewed by County decision-

makers. The County intends to continually update its maps based on service provider information and can do so as the Capital Facilities Plan is updated no less frequently than every six years.

In the text, more detail is provided about the extent of the treatment and conveyance systems based on a summary of service provider documentation. For example, on DEIS page 3.3-8 the text states for the Central Kitsap area:

“The Central Kitsap collection system consists of approximately 127 miles of gravity sewer mains ranging in size from 6 to 18 inches in diameter. Forty-four pump stations and approximately 28 miles of force mains ranging from 2 to 24 inches in diameter serve the Central Kitsap area. In 1997, Pump Stations 3, 4, 12, 13, and 17 were converted from gaseous chlorine to sodium hypochlorite for odor control. In 2003, gaseous chlorine was also removed from the Johnson Road Chlorine Station and replaced with sodium hypochlorite.

Flows from the City of Poulsbo enter the northern portion of the collection system via a gravity siphon crossing from Lemolo to Keyport, across the mouth of Liberty Bay. Collection and transfer systems serving the Meadowdale areas, downtown Silverdale, and a majority of the northern portion of the Central Kitsap collection system are undersized for existing wastewater flows. A phased expansion of the conveyance and treatment facilities is planned to repair and replace worn facilities and extend service to surrounding areas. Modifications to accommodate current flows are included in the design phase.”

Treatment capacity is an appropriate focus for the Plan/EIS because conveyance lines would be extended as development occurs, and where topographically impossible, then new alternative sewer technology policies would be in effect (see Land Use policies LU-14 to 16).

Please also note that where Sub-Area Plan information is more detailed it is still available for reference (see Policy LU-25). The DEIS Chapter 2 took note of prior information in the recent Sub-Area plans and specifically incorporated by reference applicable information from the Kingston and Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan/EIS documents.

Response to Comment 20: Forecast of Future Needs

Please see Response to Comment 19 regarding the extensive coordination with service providers on all portions of the capital facilities plan.

The DEIS notes the need to extend the sewer collection systems: “Conveyance system extensions would also be necessary to provide sanitary sewer service to developing areas within UGAs.... Extensions to conveyance systems would occur incrementally with new development, and conveyance system improvements required by growth would be financed through sewer connection fees. Funding for regular maintenance of systems is provided through user fees. In areas where there has been a significant amount of suburban large-lot development without sewer connections, funding for sewer line installation would continue to be an issue.” (DEIS page 3.3-87) Conveyance lines would be extended as development occurs, and where topographically

impossible, then new alternative sewer technology policies would be in effect (see Land Use policies LU-14 to 16).

See also Response to Comment 4 under Betsy Cooper, Letter No. 25, in Section 5.2.1.

Response to Comment 21: Location and Capacity of New Facilities

Under the inventory of facilities by each service provider a description of both existing and planned improvements is provided both in the Capital Facilities Plan (Appendix A) and the DEIS. For example, on DEIS page 3.3-83, it is noted that the Central Kitsap wastewater treatment plant is planned to be expanded: “The County plans to expand the plant based on the extent of growth predicted within the existing sewer service area. The second phase of construction at the plant will upgrade to 10.6 mgd ADF. The existing 68-acre site is expected to accommodate layout of facilities for capacity in excess of 25 mgd ADF.”

The existing plus planned capacity was reviewed in terms of the effects of alternatives. For example, on page 3.3-91 in relation to Alternative 3 the analysis notes: “Based on the current estimate of surplus ERUs and planned improvements, the treatment capacities of the County’s Central Kitsap Wastewater Facilities and the Port Orchard/Karcher Creek Sewer District treatment plant would be exceeded under Alternative 3.”

In terms of future potential locations for alternative sewer technologies, this is a new policy initiative that the County has placed a high priority to implement (Chapter 18 identifies priority levels). The County’s requirement for urban level wastewater service in UGAs (see Response to Comment 10 above) will help either spur the extension of conveyance systems or these alternative technologies.

Response to Comment 22: 6-Year Finance Plan

DEIS and FEIS Section 3.3 addresses demand for public services over the 20-year planning period. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies specific projects, costs and funding for the GMA-required 6-year period. As noted previously, service providers have been provided information with which they can assess the effect on their existing facilities, capital plans and needs, and service providers in turn have provided to the County their planned improvements for inclusion in the Capital Facilities Plan.

The County identifies the planned populations to be serviced by their sewer systems in Capital Facilities Plan Table SS.2 over both the 6-year and 20-year planning period. For the 6-year period, planned improvements include a combination of capacity and non-capacity projects. For example, sewer capacity projects on Table SS.3-1 total \$39 million whereas non-capacity projects total \$13.7 million. This is just for the County sewer systems. Other districts similarly show both capacity and non-capacity projects.

Response to Comment 23: Reassess Land Use

The comment that the plan includes the necessary policy language for land use re-assessment is noted. An exchange of information with service providers in terms of population growth, planned land use and needed improvements is described in Responses to Comments 19 and 22 above.

Response to Comment 24: Adequate Facilities Based On Occupancy

Please see Response to Comment 10 above and Response to Letter No. 25 Comment 4, Betsy Cooper. In addition, GMA uses the term "concurrency" only for roads, and the County's response is to develop "concurrency" for roads, but to require "adequate public facilities" of other types.

Response to Comment 25: Appropriate Urban Densities

Citizen groups, such as those in Silverdale and Central Kitsap, have lobbied for residential densities lower than 5 dwelling units per acre to maintain neighborhood character – as low as 3 dwelling units per acre. In *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995, the CPSGMHB found that, as a general rule, 4 dwelling units per acre or more constitutes urban densities for Kitsap County. Four dwelling units per acre addresses GMA requirements specific to Kitsap County and these community desires. See also Response to Comment 3 under the letter by the Suquamish Tribe, Letter No. 9, in Section 5.1.

Response to Comment 26: Density and Transit

Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative provide for greater housing diversity having greater percentage of multifamily unit capacity than other alternatives (22% in Alternative 2, 25% in the Preferred Alternative versus 13% for Alternatives 1 and 3). Higher density residential zones/mixed use zones would allow up to 30 du/ac in some locations rather than the current maximum of 24 du/ac.

The Preferred Alternative, similar to Alternative 2, allows higher densities in commercial and mixed use zones (e.g. minimum 10 du/ac) which are applied typically along major routes and in centers where transit service is available or more readily provided. Further, Medium and High Density Residential is applied near main roads as well and have similar or higher minimum densities.

Also, the County is retaining a density range in Urban Low of 4-9 dwelling units per acre.

Response to Comment 27: Density and Infrastructure

The County is retaining a density range in Urban Low of 4-9 dwelling units per acre to allow for flexibility in housing types, prices, and to allow for infrastructure costs to be spread as necessary. See also Response to Comment 26 regarding the greater inclusion of medium and higher density dwellings.

Regarding transportation funding gaps, the Planning Commission and BOCC considered the effects of the mitigation measures identified on DEIS Table 3.2 122, "Potential Strategies to Achieve Balance Between Transportation LOS, Financing, and Land Use." These measures would more than reduce the funding gap identified for all Alternatives reviewed (for example

\$281 million gap for Alternative 2 versus \$1.1 to \$1.5 billion in revenues). The transportation mitigation table showing the potential funding amounts reviewed by the BOCC is included in FEIS Section 3.2.6 for reference. The 6-Year Transportation Improvement Program included in the Final Plan is fully funded and balanced. In future capital planning periods, the County can look to the list of revenue source and determine the appropriate combination to meet needs.

Response to Comment 28: Appropriate Urban Densities and Noncompliance

Please see Response to Comments 25 to 27. The minimum density of 4 du/ac is an urban density and is compliant with a Kitsap County specific CPSGMHB case. The Preferred Alternative (similar to Alternative 2) does not rely solely on low densities, and incorporates a much higher percentage of medium and high density housing than Alternatives 1 and 3. The Plan includes new reasonable measures to meet density goals and provide for urban services including, but not limited to, establishing minimum densities and requiring adequate sewer service, including using innovative alternative wastewater technologies.

Response to Comment 29: Concern Regarding Funding

The County has endeavored to prepare a plan compliant in all terms with GMA. Please see above responses to comments.

Response to Comment 30: IMPRA

Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 31: Summary

Please see Responses to Comments 1 to 30 above.

Letter No. 130 Hawkins, Brian

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Racetrack in Kitsap; Need EIS

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 131 Hawkins, Grace and Earl Johnson

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 132 Helms, James J, Skinner, Virginia H.

Response to Comment 1: Support for Sub-Area Plan Adoption

The comments and support regarding the public process concerning adoption of the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Land Use Alternative 3

The comments, and support of Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Alternative 3, as it relates to your desire for Neighborhood Commercial designation for your parcels located on 4090 & 4123 Mile Hill Drive, are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does designate your parcel at 4123 Mile Hill Drive as Neighborhood Commercial. Also, please note that your parcel located at 4090 Mile Hill Drive is not designated as commercial and is identified as Urban Low in the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 3: Support of Rezone Request

The comments, as they relate to your desire for your parcels located on 1750 & 1838 Long Lake Road to be included in an Urban Growth Area, are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include these parcels in the Urban Growth Area. Please note that these parcels remain Rural Residential. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 4: Proposed Zoning

The comments as they relate to your desire to locate a co-housing development on the parcels located on 1750 & 1838 Long Lake Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 133 Heytvelt, Jim

Response to Comment 1: Appreciate Effort on the Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 134 Horovitz, Daniel

Response to Comment 1: Support for Port Orchard / South Kitsap Land Use Alternative 3

The comments and support of Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Alternative 3 and endorsement of ½ acres and 1 acre lots within the Urban Growth Area are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Your concerns regarding affordable housing in Kitsap County

area are acknowledged. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does designate some parcels within the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area as Urban Restricted, which does allow some lots to be developed at the densities discussed in your comments. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 135 Hower, Chuck

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Racetrack; Don't Change Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 136 Jacobson, Gordon

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Racetrack; Don't Change SKIA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 137 Kerkes, Gary

Response to Comment 1: Rezone Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains the current Urban Reserve of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.

Letter No. 138 Kiesel, Pam and David

Response to Comment 1: Residential Location

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Oppose NASCAR Due to Traffic, Public Funds for Infrastructure, and Need EIS

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 139 Lynch, W. Grant Jr., Great Western Sports

Response to Comment 1: Support Inclusion of IMPRA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Focus on Planning Level First

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: IMPRA Procedural Steps and Protections

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 4: Include IMPRA in Final Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 140 McCuddin, Mike

Response to Comment 1: Concerns regarding Port Orchard / South Kitsap Land Use Alternative 3

The comments regarding Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Alternative 3, specifically as it relates to the Berry Lake Road Area are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Your concerns regarding saturation of development in that neighborhood and desire to remain Urban Reserve also are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include the Berry Lake Road area within the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 141 McFadden, Michele (9/21/06)

Response to Comment 1: Exclusion of Rene Parcels from Urban Growth Area

The comments regarding the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Alternative, specifically as it relates to the property of your client, Delilah Rene are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Your desire for these parcels to remain Rural Residential has been acknowledged. Please note that these parcels are not proposed to be included in the Urban Growth Area. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Proposed Land Use for Rene Parcels

The comments regarding the intended use for these parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Quality and Quantity of Environmental Constraints on Rene Parcels

The comments regarding the quantity and quality of environmental constraints located upon the Rene parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that large portions of the entire South Kitsap region near the City of Port Orchard are similarly constrained with critical areas and habitat. Please refer to DEIS Chapter 3: Affected Environment, Significant Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, Section 3.1.

Response to Comment 4: Steep Slopes on Rene Parcels

The comments regarding the steep slopes located are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that any development within Kitsap County would be required to mitigate any potential hazards in accordance with the Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance and the Kitsap County Code regarding geotechnical regulations and requirements.

Response to Comment 5: Discussions and Questions Regarding Citizen Advisory Group Recommendations.

Mr. William Palmer was a member of the Citizen Advisory Group that drafted and voted upon the Alternatives for the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Urban Growth Area. The Citizen Advisory Group scrutinized the accommodation of growth based upon the provisions of the GMA while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure. The preferred alternative selected by the Citizen Advisory Group was the result of mapping exercises conducted at a Citizen Advisory Group meeting on April 27, 2005 and analyzed and voted upon in subsequent meetings held on May 18, June 9, and July 6, 2005. The Citizen Advisory Group recommended a Preferred Alternative on June 9, 2005 and the Land Use Alternatives in the Draft Sub-Area Plan and Draft 10-Year Update were a result of that community consensus process. Kitsap County Department of Community Staff and professional consultants provided technical assistance when requested. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 6: Pre-Existing Level of Development for Rene Parcels

The comments regarding the absence of pre-existing urban level development on the Rene parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The presence of roadways, water, and sewer systems in the vicinity of the Rene parcels is also acknowledged. Please note that areas defined to possess existing urban development and areas designated as Urban Reserve were considered by the Citizen Advisory Group. Additional expansions of the Urban Growth Area were based upon the population to be accommodated and were proposed and decided upon by the Citizen Advisory Group in a consensus based process.

Response to Comment 7: Exclusion of Rene Parcels from Urban Growth Area

Please refer to the response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 8: Pursuit of Ownership of Adjacent Parcels

Comment noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 9: Exclusion of Adjacent Parcels from Urban Growth Area

The comments regarding the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Alternative, specifically as it relates to parcels surrounding the Rene parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The desire for these adjacent parcels to remain Rural Residential has been acknowledged. Please note that two of these parcels that were proposed within the

Urban Growth Area are not proposed to be included in the preferred alternative Urban Growth Area. The remaining parcels noted in the comment were already proposed to remain rural. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 142 McFadden, Michele (10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Exclusion of Rene Parcels from Urban Growth Area

The comments regarding the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Urban Growth Area Alternative, specifically as it relates to the Delilah Rene parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The desire for these parcels to remain Rural Residential has been acknowledged. Please note that these parcels are not proposed to be included in the Urban Growth Area. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Quality and Quantity of Environmental Constraints on Rene Parcels

The comments regarding the quantity and quality of environmental constraints located upon the Rene parcels and the steep slopes on the Rene parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that large portions of the entire South Kitsap region near the City of Port Orchard are similarly constrained with critical areas and habitat. Please note that any development within Kitsap County would be required to mitigate any potential hazards in accordance with the Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance and the Kitsap County Code regarding geotechnical regulations and requirements. Please refer to Volume II, Chapter 3: Affected Environment, Significant Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.

Response to Comment 3: Status of Existing Beach Drive Sewer Line

The comments regarding the status of the existing Beach Drive sewer line are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding interpretations of the GMA are also noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Additionally, the comments regarding the potential developability of the Rene parcels are acknowledged. Please note that the Citizen Advisory Group did consider the potential impacts of critical areas through the use of the Updated Land Capacity Analysis. The presence and limitations of critical areas was similar throughout the Port Orchard / South Kitsap study area and was considered by the Citizen Advisory Groups in its evaluation of the Alternatives. Please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Response to Comment 4: Lack of Urban Medium and Urban High Land Use Designations

The comments regarding the proposal to utilize more allocations of Urban Medium and Urban High land use designations are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area plan did identify higher densities through the review of Alternative 4. Additionally the 10-Year update did incorporate significant areas of higher density

through the application of the Mixed Use land use designation. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, Volume I Chapter 2 Land Use, and Volume III. The land capacity analysis performed for sizing the Urban Growth Area boundaries utilized the minimum allowed urban densities to determine how much population could be accommodated within the different Land Use Alternatives. The urban densities used in the capacity analysis are consistent with the GMA, as interpreted by the CPSGMHB.

Response to Comment 5: Utilization of Pre-Existing Beach Drive Sewer Infrastructure

The comments regarding the pre-existing sewer infrastructure on Beach Drive and the potential difficulties of extending that infrastructure to serve upslope properties are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that Karcher Creek Sewer District did present to the Citizen Advisory Group regarding the infrastructure required to serve the entire Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan study area. The comment regarding Baby Doll as a primary trunk line for sewer service, connecting to the Mile Hill trunk line was discussed with the Citizen Advisory Group. Please refer to Volume I, Appendix A: Capital Facilities Plan, Sanitary Sewer analysis.

Response to Comment 6: Exclusion of Rene Parcels from the Urban Growth Area

Your comment are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 7: Comments not to be defined as Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments regarding the consideration of the Rene desire to remain rural as a reclassification request are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. It is acknowledged that this request was received in September 2006 and was not received prior to either the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan reclassification request deadline of May 31, 2005, nor was this request received prior to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update reclassification request deadline of April 10, 2006. It is noted that this request was received during the 60-day comment period of the 10-Year Update and should be considered a citizen comment. The comments regarding the Kitsap County Planning Commission, the deliberation process, and the consideration they may have given for any special interest request are also noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Kitsap County Planning Commission did recommend an advisory recommendation and findings of fact on October 10, 2006. Please refer to the Planning Commission Recommendations on the MyKitsap.org website.

Response to Comment 8: Remove from Plan or Expect Appeal

Your comment are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to response to Comment 1.

Letter No. 143 Minear, Karen

Response to Comment 1: Do EIS Before Judgment on NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison letter and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 144 Mischel, Jerry and Judith (09/20/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Transportation

The comments regarding the support of inclusion of the Berry Lake area due to proximity to transportation is noted. The Port Orchard / South Kitsap Citizen Advisory Group, the Kitsap County Planning Commission, and the Board of County Commissioners all selected Land Use Alternative 2 for the Berry Lake area that best met the requirements of the Washington State GMA. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Employment and Potential Schools

The comments regarding the support of inclusion of the Berry Lake area due to employment and potential schools are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 3: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Adjacent Development

The comments regarding the development of parcels at the intersection of Anderson Hill Road and SW Old Clifton Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The development discussed in the comment is within the existing Urban Growth Area of the McCormick Woods / ULID #6 Urban Growth Area and was approved with the McCormick Woods / ULID #6 Sub-Area Plan in 2003.

Response to Comment 4: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Commercial Land

The comments regarding the inclusion of commercial land use designations at the east end of Berry Lake Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 5: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Water & Sewer Infrastructure

The comments regarding the inclusion of water and sewer infrastructure in the proximity of the Berry Lake Road area are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 6: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Geographical Distance to Urban Centers

The comments regarding the geographical distance of the Berry Lake area to the City of Port Orchard in comparison with other areas within the Preferred Alternative are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 7: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Number of Land Use Reclassification Requests in Area

The comments regarding the number of property owners along Berry Lake Road that have submitted Land Use Reclassification Requests are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. These Land Use Reclassification Requests, in addition to Public Comments for the Berry Lake area to remain rural, were thoroughly considered throughout the decision making process of both the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan and the Kitsap County 10-Year Update.

Response to Comment 8: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Impacts of Past Implementation of GMA

The comments regarding the impacts of administration of the GMA are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The request to restore one-acre density in the rural areas of Kitsap County has not been supported by either the GMA or the CPSGMHB in the recent past. Please refer to response to Comment 1 regarding the selection process for a preferred alternative for the 20-year planning period.

Letter No. 145 Mischel, Jerry (10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Adjacent Development

The comments regarding the proximity of development of parcels at the intersection of Anderson Hill Road and SW Old Clifton Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The development discussed in the comment is within the existing Urban Growth Area of the McCormick Woods / ULID #6 Urban Growth Area and was approved with the McCormick Woods / ULID #6 Sub-Area Plan in 2003.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Transportation

The comments regarding the support of inclusion of the Berry Lake area due to proximity to transportation are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding the impacts of adjacent development have also been noted. The Port Orchard / South Kitsap Citizen Advisory Group, the Kitsap County Planning Commission, and the Board of County Commissioners all selected Land Use Alternative 2 for the Berry Lake area that best met the requirements of the GMA. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 3: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Number of Retired Citizens Negatively Affected by the GMA

The comments regarding the number of property owners along Berry Lake Road that may be nearing retirement or desire the return of previous zoning in effect prior to the administration of the GMA are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The request to restore one-acre density in the rural areas of Kitsap County has not been supported by either the GMA or the CPSGMHB in recent past. Please refer to response to Comment 2 regarding the selection process for a preferred alternative for the 20-year planning period.

Response to Comment 4: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Designation of Urban Reserve in 1998 Comprehensive Plan

The comments regarding the designation of Urban Reserve lands in the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Urban Reserve lands were the first to be analyzed for accommodation of any expansion of the Urban Growth Area. The Citizen Advisory Group scrutinized the accommodation of growth based upon the provisions of the GMA while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure, in addition to the areas with Urban Reserve designation. The preferred alternative selected by the Citizen Advisory Group was the result of that community consensus process. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Comments were received in the Berry Lake area for both inclusion and exclusion from the Urban Growth Area.

Response to Comment 5: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Number of Land Use Reclassification Requests in Area

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 6: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Transportation

The comments regarding the support of inclusion of the Berry Lake area due to proximity to transportation is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Port

Orchard / South Kitsap Citizen Advisory Group, the Kitsap County Planning Commission, and the Board of County Commissioners all selected Land Use Alternative 2 for the Berry Lake area that best met the requirements of the Washington State GMA. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 7: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Proximity of Adjacent Urban Areas

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 4.

Letter No. 146 Mischel, Ken (10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1:

Response to Comment 1: Support of Inclusion of the Berry Lake Area in Urban Growth Area Due to Designation of Urban Reserve in 1998 Comprehensive Plan

The comments regarding the designation of Urban Reserve lands in the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan for the Berry Lake area are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Urban Reserve lands were the first to be analyzed for accommodation of any expansion of the Urban Growth Area. The Citizen Advisory Group scrutinized the accommodation of growth based upon the provisions of the GMA while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure, in addition to the areas with Urban Reserve designation. Comments were received in the Berry Lake area for both inclusion and exclusion from the Urban Growth Area. The preferred alternative selected by the Citizen Advisory Group was the result of that community consensus process. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 147 Nordgren, John and Arleta

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 148 Palmer, Bill

Response to Comment 1: Support of Grant Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located on Bay Street on Sinclair Inlet as Urban High Residential are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain within the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Coulon Land Use Reclassification Request

The comment and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 6491 SE Mile Hill Drive as Highway Tourist Commercial. Your request and comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Rural Residential. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 3: Support of BISCO LLC Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 600 feet south of SE Ives Mill Road on Bethel Avenue as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to be included inside the Urban Growth Area as Mixed Use. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 4: Support of Edwards Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 2232 SE Sedgwick Road as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to be included inside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 5: Support of Haskins Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 2208 SE Sedgwick Road as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to be included inside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 6: Support of Almacen Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 4311 Bethel Road SE as all Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to be included inside the Urban Growth Area as all Highway Tourist Commercial. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 7: Support of Pickens Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 4804 Phillips Road as Urban Low are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to be included inside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 8: Support of Higgens/Shaw Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the 43.69-acre parcel located on Phillips Road as Urban Low are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to be included inside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low and Urban Restricted. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 9: Support of Larson Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 4194 Division Avenue West as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Reserve. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 10: Support of Higgens/Shaw Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 8.

Response to Comment 11: Support of Hatch Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 1736 SE Cashmere Street as Urban Low are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Rural Protection. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 12: Support of Ortendahl Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located on Woods Road SE as Urban Low are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Rural Residential. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 13: Support of Ortendahl Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 5023 Beach Drive as Urban Low are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Rural Residential. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 149 Paquette, Phillip E. Jr.

Response to Comment 1: Pass Along Opinions and Objections

The comments have been forwarded to the decision-makers on the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update.

Response to Comment 2: KAPO and Developers

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Concern about TDR Program

The TDR program is designed to allow rural property owners options other than the development of their properties in rural areas. By transferring existing development rights from rural to urban areas, the County is encouraging development where public infrastructure is more readily available while maintaining rural character.

Response to Comment 4: Manchester Lot Aggregation

The Manchester Community Council (MCC) is an ad hoc community group that is not formally sanctioned by the County. This allows the group to determine their membership and voting structure. Any votes taken or views expressed by this group are considered just as any citizens.

Response to Comment 5: Lot Aggregation Revision

The Manchester Community Council (MCC) proposed revisions to the lot combination language contained in Kitsap County Code for the Manchester Rural Village. The language was reviewed by County staff and included in the draft proposal for the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update. Upon closer review of the proposed revision, it was found that it did not maintain the intent of the Manchester Community Plan adopted in 2002. After consultation with County staff, the MCC

proposed additional revisions to bring the language into consistency with this the adopted intent. This revised language (shown in the Volume III: Proposed Regulation Errata Sheet) has been reviewed by the decision makers during discussions on the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update.

Response to Comment 6: Mixing Urban and Rural Issues

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see above responses.

Response to Comment 7: Conform to GMA

The Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners have considered all submitted documentation and public comment during their review of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update.

Letter No. 150 Parker, Martha

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 151 Penovich, Linda

Response to Comment 1: Support of Port Orchard / South Kitsap Land Use Alternative 3

The comments and support of Port Orchard / South Kitsap UGA Alternative 3, as it relates to the parcels located on Anderson Hill Road are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects these parcels are to remain outside the UGA as Urban Reserve. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Designation of Urban Reserve Lands in 1998 Comprehensive Plan

The comments regarding the designation of Urban Reserve lands in the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan for the Anderson Hill SW area are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Citizen Advisory Group scrutinized the accommodation of growth based upon the provisions of the GMA while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure, in addition to the areas with Urban Reserve designation. The connection to the existing McCormick Woods / ULID #6 Urban Growth Area was considered by the Citizen Advisory Group, Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners. The preferred alternative selected by the Citizen Advisory Group was the result of that community consensus process. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006.

Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 152 Plummer, Grant and Karen

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR; DO EIS

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 153 Prentice, Janet

Response to Comment 1: Support Inclusion of Berry Lake Road Area in Urban Growth Area

The comments and support of rural designation for parcels south of Berry Lake Road and North of Glenwood Road SW are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects these parcels are to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Rural. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 154 Ramsey, Diane

Response to Comment 1: Agricultural Zone and Perpetual Protection for Parks

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. County rural zoning allows for agriculture. Policies support agriculture and natural resources in Volume I, Chapter 3. Parks Zoning is a part of the Preferred Alternative for publicly owned parks and recreation facilities.

Response to Comment 2: UGAs Small As Possible

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative UGAs are just under the 20-year growth forecast as a whole, but reasonable measures, interjurisdictional planning, and flexible density ranges are intended to help make efficient use of land.

Response to Comment 3: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 155 Randall, Cynthia

Response to Comment 1: Change No Rules in SKIA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 156 Reeves, Connie

Response to Comment 1: Availability of Draft Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The draft plan is available as an Adobe PDF document for download from Mykitsap.org.

Response to Comment 2: Inclusion of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a request regarding the designation of your parcel located at 3841 SE Phillips Road as Urban High are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain inside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 157 Reid, Rod

Response to Comment 1: Table Rural Wooded Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time.

Letter No. 158 Row, Donald and Romelia

Response to Comment 1: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a request regarding the designation of the parcel located at 3677 SE Salmonberry Road as Urban Low are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is within the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 159 Ruthkowski, Christine

Response to Comment 1: Enclosed Letter to Newspaper about Racetrack

The comments are noted. The letter is part of the FEIS record.

Response to Comment 2: Citizen Feelings about Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 160 Sherrard, Gene

Response to Comment 1: Request Location

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Support for Inclusion in Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA as Industrial

With the Preferred Alternative, the subject property is classified as Industrial and lies in a Rural area immediately adjacent to Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA boundaries as proposed in Alternative 2. The property is not included in the Preferred Alternative as an Urban Industrial area, but retains a Rural Industrial classification and can continue to operate and grow according to similar rules as today.

Response to Comment 3: Change Map to Include Property to the South

Please see Response to Comment 2.

Letter No. 161 Simpson, Dennis

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR; DO EIS

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 162 Skrobut, Doug

Response to Comment 1: Revisions for TDR – When Required

The comments regarding the TDR Program and request for revisions to Sections A & B of Chapter 17.430.070 are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners includes the Transfer of Development Program with the Sections A & B of Chapter 17.430.070 intact with additional provisions. The additional provisions allow for the Board of County Commissioners to decide at the time of adoption if subsequent expansions of Urban Growth Areas through the Sub-Area Plan or Comprehensive Plan update process will require Transfer of Development Credits for those expansions. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative for Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a request regarding the designation of the approximately 100 acres of parcels located at Sunnyslope Road SW as Rural Residential are noted and forwarded to

the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects these parcels are to remain outside the Urban Growth Area as Rural Wooded. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 163 Spady, Jay B.

Response to Comment 1: NASCAR Plan Premature; DO EIS

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 164 Stodden, Helen K.

Response to Comment 1: Acre Zoning for Parcel

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the parcel is currently located in an Urban Reserve designation and a single home may be developed on the existing 5-acre property. This same Urban Reserve classification is retained in the Preferred Alternative.

Letter No. 165 Struck, Phil

Response to Comment 1: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of your parcels totaling 120 acres located within the Gorst Urban Growth Boundary are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Kitsap County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners scrutinized the accommodation of growth based upon the provisions of the GMA while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure, in addition to the areas with Urban Reserve designation. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects these parcels to be located within the Gorst Urban Growth Area. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 3: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 4: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Letter No. 166 Trudeau, Debra D'Andrea

Response to Comment 1: Oppose Nonconforming Lot Changes in Manchester

The Manchester Community Plan adopted in 2002 included language requiring the combination of properties of insufficient size to address stormwater impacts and community character. The general concern of the community was that properties with existing homes built over multiple lots would be redeveloped with multiple homes. Additionally, with so many areas of contiguous vacant lots uphill from many developed areas, that each of these lots, if developed, would create significant stormwater impacts to the Manchester area. The proposed revision does not remove the requirement for properties in these circumstances to combine, but does allow owners with two contiguous lots, with a home built entirely upon one, to develop the other. Generally, this allows the maintenance of community character and mitigates stormwater impacts without restricting the owners' abilities to develop the second lot. The County has developed and will continue to develop regional stormwater facilities (Main Street outfall, Van Buren regional pond) to mitigate the historic impacts of development in the area. The Manchester Community Plan will be reviewed beginning in 2007 with possible revisions to these requirements, among others, for the Manchester area.

Letter No. 167 Valentino, Mike (9/27/06)

Response to Comment 1: Manchester Non-Conforming Lot Regulations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 168 Valentino, Mike (10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Manchester Non-Conforming Lot Regulations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Manchester Community Council Recommendations on Non-Conforming Lot Regulations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Overview of Manchester Community Council Deliberations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 169 Wilson, Michael R.

Response to Comment 1: Proposed Manchester Non-Conforming Lot Regulations

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Manchester Community Plan will be reviewed beginning in 2007 where the issue of lot combination will likely be addressed at length.

Letter No. 170 Wright, Debbie

Response to Comment 1: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a request regarding the designation of your parcel located at 4010 SE Lovell Street as Highway Tourist Commercial are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain inside the Urban Growth Area as Urban Low. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Letter No. 171 Wrothwell, Ruthie

Response to Comment 1: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and submission of a Land Use Reclassification Request regarding the designation of your parcel located at 1612 SW Old Clifton Road as Urban Low Residential are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Citizen Advisory Group scrutinized the accommodation of growth based upon the provisions of the GMA while considering community values, environmental constraints, provisions of services and infrastructure. The preferred alternative selected by the Citizen Advisory Group was the result of mapping exercises conducted at a Citizen Advisory Group meeting on April 27, 2005 and analyzed and voted upon in subsequent meetings held on May 18, June 9, and July 6, 2005. The Citizen Advisory Group recommended a Preferred Alternative on June 9, 2005 and the Land Use Alternatives in the Draft Sub-Area Plan and Draft 10-Year Update were a result of that community consensus process. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. The Preferred Alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners reflects this parcel is to remain outside of the Urban Growth Area as Urban Reserve. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments and support of Land Use Alternative 3 as the best alternative for meeting personal and property goals are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments, history, and context of this parcel are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 4: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 5: Support of Land Use Reclassification Request

Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

5.2.4. Unspecified

Table 5.2-1 lists citizen, business and property owner comment letters from commenters that did not identify addresses, property location, or names. The agency letters appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment.

**Table 5.2-4. Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters:
Unspecified Locations**

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
172	Bohman, Donald		10/24/2006
173	Cook, George	Quadrant Homes	10/30/2006
174	Daniel		10/26/2006
175	Ducker, Brion		10/27/2006
176	Lloyd, Jeanne		10/27/2006
177	Lundstrom, Wade		10/20/2006
178	Olson, Norm	N.L. Olson & Associates, Inc.	9/21/2006
179	Samilson, Terry		10/22/2006
180	Samilson, Terry		10/27/2006
181	Taylor, Diane		10/22/2006
182	Taylor, John		9/14/2006
183	Ueland, Craig		10/26/2006
184	Unnamed		9/7/2006
185	Unnamed		9/7/2006
186	Unnamed	Harper Church Suggestion	9/7/2006
187	Unnamed	Audubon Washington	9/20/2006
188	Unnamed	Cumulative Effects of Urbanization	9/20/2006
189	Van Slyke		10/23/2006

Letter No. 172 Bohman, Donald

Response to Comment 1: Vote No on Racetrack: Citizen Polls on Racetrack

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 173 Cook, George E, P.E. , Quadrant Homes

Response to Comment 1: Overall Comments

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Lot Sizes-Generally

The issue of minimum lot sizes in urban areas is slated for discussion in Phase II of Code Development in the first half of 2007. Lot sizes are generally meant to address many other issues with residential development (parking, landscaping, neighborhood character, traffic circulation, etc.) that, if addressed separately would allow additional flexibility in lot sizes.

Response to Comment 3: Urban Restricted Density Calculation & Lot Widths & Sizes

The Urban Restricted zone is intended to provide greater protection of environmentally sensitive areas through lower net densities and larger lot sizes. Discussion of these issues will be covered in Phase II of Code Development in the first half of 2007. This discussion may include project-wide impervious surface limitations as options to larger lot sizes.

Response to Comment 4: Proposed Lot Sizes

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The County supports affordable housing for a diverse group of citizens. This affordability must be balanced with sustainability, overall impacts to surrounding properties and appropriate infrastructure provision.

Letter No. 174 Daniel (No Last Name)

Response to Comment 1: Home Prices will Go Up and Price Out Families

The Preferred Alternative would increase UGA boundaries and increase densities to meet the housing needs of the expected population growth. Housing Element policies promote first time homebuyer programs.

Letter No. 175 Ducker, Brion

Response to Comment 1: Can Development Meet Densities Given Topography

Each alternative has been reviewed with a land capacity analysis that accounts for critical areas, roads, market factors etc. to review net developable acres that can accommodate growth.

Response to Comment 2: Support Alternative 3

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 176 Lloyd, Jeanne

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR; DO EIS

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 177 Lundstrom, Wade

Response to Comment 1: NASCAR Could Destroy Seattle Cruise Industry

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 178 Olson, Norm

Response to Comment 1: Urban Restricted Zoning Classification

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Proposed Density Calculation

The Preferred Alternative includes a density of 1-5 du/ac for Urban Restricted and the formula to calculate density is gross acres minus critical areas. Unlike Alternative 2, it does not exclude buffers from the calculation.

Letter No. 179 Samilson, Terry (10/22/06)

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 180 Samilson, Terry (10/27/06)

Response to Comment 1: Appreciate Response

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 181 Taylor, Diane

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 182 Taylor, John

Response to Comment 1: Appreciation for Great Job

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 183 Ueland, Craig

Response to Comment 1: Direct Impacts of RWIP

The comments regarding the RWIP and the direct impact it may have upon parcels under your ownership and yourself are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Support of RWIP

The comments regarding support of adoption of the RWIP within the Preferred Alternative for the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding the adoption of the RWIP as a starting point in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update are also noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the RWIP has been included in the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 3: Impacts of RWIP

Please refer to Response to Comment 2.

Response to Comment 4: Economic Impacts of RWIP

The comments regarding the RWIP as a starting point for a meaningful and mutually beneficial improvement program are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding economic impacts of Rural lands and the current real estate market are also noted.

Response to Comment 5: History and Impacts of Rural Wooded Policy

The comments regarding the RWIP history and the impacts of the Interim Rural Forest designation has had upon rural property owners are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 2.

Response to Comment 6: Long Term Impacts of RWIP

Please refer to Response to Comment 2.

Letter No. 184 Unnamed 1 (09/07/06; Thanks)

Response to Comment 1: Appreciation for Hard Works

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 185 Unnamed 2 (09/07/06; Public Vote)

Response to Comment 1: Will Public Vote Before Growth Management?

Following the citizen input received during the public review process as well as citizen input by the Planning Commission, the BOCC will vote to adopt the Comprehensive Plan.

Letter No. 186 Unnamed 3 (09/07/06; Alternative Meeting Location)

Response to Comment 1: Givens Center Meeting Location Too Noisy

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 187 Unnamed 4

Response to Comment 1: Submittal of Audubon, Washington Watershed Planning Document

The submittal is part of the FEIS record. Please see DEIS Section 3.1.3 for a discussion of watershed conditions and prior watershed planning efforts.

Letter No. 188 Unnamed 5

Response to Comment 1: Submittal of May et al. Paper

The submittal is part of the FEIS record. Please note that this paper was considered in the analysis of natural environment impacts. See DEIS page 3.1-92.

Letter No. 189 Van Slyke, Rollo and Deanna

Response to Comment 1: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

5.3. Interest Groups

Interest groups, such as local nonprofit agencies, advocacy groups, etc. submitted comments on the DEIS and are listed in Table 5.3-1. The agency letters appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment.

Table 5.3-1. Interest Group Comment Letters: Unspecified Locations

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
190	Klatman, Silva	Bremerton Chamber	10/30/2006
191	Dicks, Ryan	Cascade Land Conservancy	10/9/2006
192	Bertrand, Mary	Chums of Barker Creek	9/14/2006
193	Bertrand, Mary	Chums of Barker Creek	9/20/2006
194	Bertrand, Mary	Chums of Barker Creek	10/23/2006
195	Vancil, Ryan	Chums of Barker Creek/Concerned Citizens for Central Valley	10/30/2006
196	Unnamed	Concerned Citizens for Central Valley	9/20/2006
197	Unnamed	Concerned Citizens for Central Valley	9/20/2006
198	Unnamed	Concerned Citizens of Central Valley Group	10/30/2006
199	Spitzer, Peter	Dyes Inlet Preservation Council	9/14/2006
200	Spitzer, Peter	Dyes Inlet Preservation Council	9/16/2006
201	Dold, Jennifer of Briklin, Newman, Dold, Attorneys	Dyes Inlet Preservation Council	9/21/2006
202	Province, James	Dyes Inlet Preservation Council	9/21/2006
203	Best, Robert	Dyes Inlet Preservation Council	9/24/2006
204	Unnamed	Homebuilder Association	9/20/2006
205	Unnamed	Homebuilder Association	10/23/2006
206	Sheeran, Dennis and Aho, Jim	Illahee Community Citizens Group	9/18/2006
207	Unnamed	Illahee Community Citizens Group	9/20/2006
208	Unnamed	Illahee Community Citizens Group	9/21/2006
209	Sheeran, Dennis and Aho, Jim	Illahee Community Citizens Group	9/25/2006
210	Sheeran, Dennis and Aho, Jim	Illahee Community Citizens Group	9/27/2006
211	Aho, Jim	Illahee Community Citizens Group	10/23/2006
212	Krigsman, Judith	Illahee Forest Preserve	10/23/2006
213	Brennan, Eugene	Illahee Forest Preserve	10/25/2006
214	Aho, Jim	Illahee Forest Preserve	10/30/2006
215	Boyle, Dale & Krigsman, Irwin	Illahee Forest Preserve, Illahee Forest Stewardship Committee and Illahee Community Citizens Group	10/30/2006
216	Krigsman, Judith G.	Illahee Forest Stewardship Committee	9/24/2006
217	Lee, John	Johnson Creek Association	9/25/2006
218	Lee, John	Johnson Creek Association	10/30/2006
219	Unnamed	Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners	9/27/2006

Letter #	Name (Last, First)	Agency/Company	Date Received
220	Henderson, Vivian	Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners	10/30/2006
221	Burrow, Charlie and Donnelly, Tom	Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning	9/5/2006
222	Burrow, Charlie and Donnelly, Tom	Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning	9/18/2006
223	Burrow, Charlie and Donnelly, Tom	Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning	9/23/2006
224	Burrow, Charlie and Donnelly, Tom	Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning	10/17/2006
225	Burrow, Charlie and Donnelly, Tom	Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning	10/23/2006
226	Looney, William C.	Kitsap Community & Agriculture Alliance	9/27/2006
227	Eliason, Mike	Kitsap County Association of Realtors	9/13/2006
228	Palmer, William M.	Tracyton North Tigers Community Group	9/21/2006
229	Metcalf, Jacob	Young Democrats of Kitsap County	9/20/2006

Letter No. 190 Bremerton Chamber

Response to Comment 1: Support International Speedway Corporation

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: State of Kitsap's Economy

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Keep Opportunity Open; Have High Standards

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Letter No. 191 Cascade Land Conservancy

Response to Comment 1: Definition of Development Rights

The comments and information regarding the TDR Program and definition are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The definition of the "Development Rights" is noted in the Transfer of Development Right code provisions. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 2: TDR Purpose

The comments and information regarding the TDR Program and purpose are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The program purpose clearly identifying preservation of

open space is noted in the Transfer of Development Right code provisions. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 3: TDR Authority

The comments and information regarding the TDR Program and the provisions for interaction with municipal jurisdictions for acceptance of transferred development rights through the program are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The program intent is to clearly establish the TDR protocol for each jurisdiction separately through the UGAMA process. This UGAMA process is proposed in 2008 to form a consensus based approach to resolving jurisdictional issues for the associated Urban Growth Areas and the elements of land use pertaining to those growth areas and future annexations. The discussion and resolution of the method for each jurisdiction to participate in the TDR program is preservation of open space is noted in the Kitsap County Transfer of Development Right program will be discussed through the UGAMA process. Please refer to Volume I, Chapter 18. Implementation, Table 18-1, Land Use Goal 10 (Page 18-2).

Response to Comment 4: TDR Required in Cities

Please refer to Response to Comment 3.

Response to Comment 5: Application of TDR in RWIP

The comments relating to the application of the TDR Program within the RWIP are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The application of the TDR program is intended to work independently yet seamlessly within the RWIP. The provisions of the coordination of both programs will be addressed in the application of the RWIP.

Letter No. 192 Chums of Barker Creek (Mary Bertrand; 9/14/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support Downzone of Barker Creek Corridor

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative shows the Barker Creek corridor as Rural Residential.

Response to Comment 2: Support Park Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes Park Zoning.

Response to Comment 3: Alternative 2 Should Not Have Included Ross Property North of Waaga Way

Consistent with its comprehensive plan amendment regulations, the County considered land use reclassification requests in developing land use alternatives to test for environmental impacts. The DEIS reviews natural and built environment impacts of DEIS Alternatives 2 and 3 that included nearly all land use reclassification requests throughout the County including the UGA expansion request north of Waaga Way. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 4: Don't Include 30 Units Per Acre in Alternative 2

As a reasonable measure consistent with GMA goals, the County is proposing to increase the allowable densities from 24 du/ac in the High Density Residential and several commercial zones to 30 du/ac. A similar density range would apply in new Mixed Use zones. This allows for an efficient land use pattern particularly along corridors and in centers. The 30 du/ac is a maximum, with the minimum being 10 du/ac. Actual densities are required to be in that range. The density range is intended to provide for housing variety and facilitate transit and other services.

Letter No. 193 Chums of Barker Creek (Mary Bertrand; 9/20/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support Alternative 2 Except North of Waaga Way

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Rural Lifestyle, Habitat Protection, Sewer Line Unavailable

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The DEIS addresses the land use and habitat impacts of Alternatives 2 and 3. DEIS Appendix E notes the location of sewer facilities, but does not indicate that the line can be accessed by development or if improvements are necessary prior to development. Please also see Response to Comment 6, Letter No. 195.

Response to Comment 3: Comprehensive Plan, Kingston Sub-Area Plan, and Critical Areas Ordinance

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The 1998 Comprehensive Plan met GMA requirements, and is being updated in accordance with GMA provisions. Kingston Sub-Area Plan remand items are addressed in the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update. The Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance was largely upheld by the CPSGMHB, and the few remanded items will be addressed.

Response to Comment 4: Stand on Critical Areas Ordinance

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 194 Chums of Barker Creek (Mary Bertrand; 10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Deny UGA Expansion of Central Kitsap UGA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Oppose NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 3: Attorney Analysis

Please see Responses to Comments in Letter No. 195 below.

Response to Comment 4: Attorney Analysis

Please see Responses to Comments in Letter No. 195 below.

Response to Comment 5: Attorney Analysis

Please see Responses to Comments in Letter No. 195 below.

Response to Comment 6: Attorney Analysis

Please see Responses to Comments in Letter No. 195 below.

Response to Comment 7: Attorney Analysis

Please see Responses to Comments in Letter No. 195 below.

Letter No. 195 Chums of Barker Creek and Concerned Citizens for Central Valley (Ryan Vancil; 10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Deny Royal Valley Consistent with Planning Commission Recommendation

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 2: Bremerton Opposes Expansion in This Area

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way. Please see City of Bremerton letter in Section 5.1.

Response to Comment 3: Royal Valley Low Rating for Suitability

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. DEIS Appendix E includes an evaluation of land use reclassification requests including the Royal Valley location. The criteria for evaluation are contained in that Appendix.

Response to Comment 4: Royal Valley Low Rating for Consistency

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. DEIS Appendix E includes an evaluation of land use reclassification requests including the Royal Valley location. The criteria for evaluation are contained in that Appendix.

Response to Comment 5: Royal Valley Inconsistent with GMA Goals for Sprawl, Natural Resources, and Environment

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Volume I, Chapter 1 that lists all the GMA goals the County must balance in considering plans and regulations.

Response to Comment 6: Royal Valley Should Have Received Low Score on Services and Facilities

DEIS Appendix E notes regarding the site indicated: “Central Valley Rd is at LOS A near the subject parcel. Water is available on the site. A wastewater line runs through the subject parcels.” The summary text identifies the location of services; it is not a detailed review of conditions and does not indicate that the line can be accessed by development or if improvements are necessary prior to development. However, please note that Appendix A of the commenter’s letter that allows sewer connection due to a failing septic system also states: “Intensification or expansion of use on the property shall not be allowed unless and until it is designated as an urban growth area, or as otherwise subject to Comprehensive Plan amendment authorizing the same.”

Response to Comment 7: No Support for Proposal

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 196 Concerned Citizens for Central Valley (Unsigned; 9/20/06; Originally Submitted to Silverdale CAC, then at 10-Year Update Hearings)

Response to Comment 1: Supplements Petitions to CAC

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: CAC Roles and Responsibilities

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see the numerous public involvement opportunities provided through the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update in Chapter 1 of the Comprehensive Plan and Appendix A of the FEIS.

Response to Comment 3: Sewer Line and CAC Determining Factor

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Staff Report for Site Specific Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1.

Response to Comment 5: Avoid UGA Expansion

Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 6: Impacts to Salmon Habitat

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1.

Response to Comment 7: Don't Create Urban Peninsula

Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 8: Support Existing Residential Character

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 197 Concerned Citizens for Central Valley (Unsigned; 9/20/06; submitted to 10-Year Update Hearings)

Response to Comment 1: Members Involved in Central Valley

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: GMA Goals for Citizen Participation

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see the numerous public involvement opportunities provided through the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update in Chapter 1 of the Comprehensive Plan and Appendix A of the FEIS.

Response to Comment 3: GMA Goals for Environmental Protection

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. GMA goals are acknowledged in Chapter 1 of the Comprehensive Plan. Natural environment analysis related to Alternatives 2 and 3 is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1.

Response to Comment 4: CK UGA Expansion Natural Features

The comment is noted. Please see DEIS Appendix E.

Response to Comment 5: Rural Areas and Open Space Protection and UGA Boundaries

The comment is noted. Consistent with its comprehensive plan amendment regulations, the County considered land use reclassification requests in developing land use alternatives to test for environmental impacts. The DEIS reviews natural and built environment impacts of DEIS Alternatives 2 and 3 that included nearly all land use reclassification requests throughout the County including the UGA expansion request north of Waaga Way. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Response to Comment 6: Critical Areas Protection

Please see Response to Comment 5.

Response to Comment 7: Remove Central Valley from UGA

Please see Response to Comment 5.

Letter No. 198 Concerned Citizens of Central Valley Group (Unnamed; 10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Allow Royal Valley Site into UGA Due to Master Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include a UGA expansion north of Waaga Way.

Letter No. 199 Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Peter Spitzer, 9/14/06)

Response to Comment 1: Opposition to Cadwell/Huish Reclassification Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Cadwell/Huish Site Conditions

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 3: Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Impacts to Dyes Inlet

Volume II (DEIS) of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update evaluated potential impacts associated with three alternative land use designations. For the Cadwell/Huish property, Alternative 1 (No Action) continued the current Urban Restricted designation and zoning, Alternative 2 considered an Urban Medium/Urban High designation and Urban High Residential (19-30) zoning designation, and Alternative 3 considered an Urban High Residential designation. The Preferred Alternative described in this FEIS would establish an Urban Medium/High designation, with an implementing zoning designation of Urban High Residential (19-30 units/acre) for the site.

The comments regarding potential impacts to the natural drainage system are noted. Environmental review of the proposed reclassification of properties under each of the alternatives is documented in Volume II (DEIS). Natural environment analysis is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. Review was conducted at a programmatic area-wide basis. At a site-specific level, County regulations and requirements for identification and protection of critical areas and for stormwater management must be satisfied as part of any future development proposal.

The comments regarding the lack of need for additional residential capacity in this area are noted. As described in Volume II (DEIS), the total residential capacity for the Silverdale Sub-Area is slightly below the housing target for the Silverdale UGA, even when the proposed reclassification of the Cadwell/Huish property is included. Please refer to Chapter 3.2, Section 3.2.3 of the DEIS.

Response to Comment 4: Reclassification Request Not Consistent with Proposed Silverdale Sub-Area Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Reclassification Request Not Consistent with the Proposed Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Land Use Reclassification Evaluation

The comments are noted. As described in the Draft Land Use Reclassification Evaluation, that document was intended as a preliminary evaluation of the reclassification requests based on available information.

Potential impacts associated with the all reclassification requests are addressed in Volume II (DEIS) of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update. Natural environment analysis is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. Review was conducted at a programmatic area-wide basis. Any future development of the property would require site-specific review and compliance with the County's Critical Areas Ordinance and stormwater requirements.

Response to Comment 7: Opposition to Reclassification Request at 9506 Mickleberry Street NW

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 200 Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Peter Spitzer, 9/16/06)

Response to Comment 1: Opposition to Cadwell/Huish Reclassification Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Cadwell/Huish Site Conditions

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 3: Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Impacts to Dyes Inlet

Please refer to Letter No. 199 (Dyes Inlet Preservation Council, Spitzer, 9/14/06), response to Comment No. 3.

Response to Comment 4: No Need for Additional Residential Capacity

The comments regarding the lack of need for additional residential capacity in this area are noted. As described in Volume II (DEIS), the total residential capacity for the Silverdale Sub-area is slightly below the housing target for the Silverdale UGA, even when the proposed reclassification of the Cadwell/Huish property is included. Please refer to Chapter 3.2, Section 3.2.3 of the DEIS.

Response to Comment 5: Reclassification Request Not Consistent with Proposed Silverdale Sub-Area Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Closing Comments

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 201 Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (9/21/06; Jennifer A. Dold)

Response to Comment 1: Opposition to the Cadwell/Huish Reclassification Request

The comments in opposition to the Cadwell/Huish Reclassification Request are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Relationship to the Dyes Inlet Open Space Study Area

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 3: Consistency with Comprehensive Plan and Impacts to Dyes Inlet

Volume II (DEIS) of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update evaluated potential impacts associated with three alternative land use designations. For the Cadwell/Huish property, Alternative 1 (No Action) continued the current Urban Restricted designation and zoning, Alternative 2 considered an Urban Medium/Urban High designation and Urban High Residential (19-30) zoning designation, and Alternative 3 considered an Urban High Residential designation. The Preferred Alternative described in this FEIS would establish an Urban Medium/High designation, with an implementing zoning designation of Urban High Residential (19-30 units/acre) for the site.

The comments regarding potential impacts to the natural drainage system are noted. Environmental review of the proposed reclassification of properties under each of the alternatives is documented in Volume II (DEIS). Natural environment analysis is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. Review was conducted at a programmatic area-wide basis. At a site-specific level, County regulations and requirements for identification and protection of critical areas and for stormwater management must be satisfied as part of any future development proposal.

Response to Comment 4: Wetlands on Social Security Building Property

The comments regarding the development of the Social Security building are noted. Development of this property was completed in a manner consistent with the Kitsap County Critical Areas Ordinance. Recently, the County's Critical Areas Ordinance was updated. The Social Security Building development was approved under the prior Critical Areas Ordinance.

Response to Comment 5: Opposition to Reclassification of the Cadwell/Huish Property

The comments in opposition to reclassification of this property are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Under the Preferred Alternative described in this FEIS, the property

would be zoned Urban High Residential (19-30 units/acre) and the parcel immediately to the north would be zoned Regional Commercial.

Kitsap County regulations and requirements for identification and protection of critical areas and for stormwater management must be satisfied as part of any future site-specific development proposal.

Response to Comment 6: Protection of Critical Areas in UGAs

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 7: Support for Urban Restricted Designation

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 8: Reclassification Request Would be Inconsistent with Proposed Silverdale Sub-Area Element of the Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 9: Reclassification Request Would be Inconsistent with Proposed Open Space Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 10: Reclassification Request Would be Inconsistent with Proposed Surface Water and Natural System Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 11: Reclassification Request Would be Inconsistent with Proposed Plant, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Goals and Policies of the Comprehensive Plan

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 12: Request that Reclassification Request be Rejected

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 202 Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (9/21/06; James A. Province)

Response to Comment 1: Opposition to the Minor Business Application at 9582 Tracyton Boulevard NW

The comments, originally submitted on August 18, 2005, in opposition to an earlier permit application for a Minor Business Application at 9582 Tracyton Boulevard NW, are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The site addressed in the letter is the subject of a current Land Use Reclassification Request (referred to as the Warden Request) from Urban Low Residential to Urban High or Highway Tourist Commercial. As described in this FEIS, the

Preferred Alternative would rezone this property to Mixed Use, with a residential density of 10 to 30 units/acre.

Letter No. 203 Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (9/24/06; Robert Best)

Response to Comment 1: Reference to Stipulated Settlement and Order of Dismissal

The reference to the Stipulated Settlement and Order of Dismissal No. 90-2-02816-5 is noted.

Response to Comment 2: Reference to Open Space Study Area

The reference to the Open Space Study area is noted. A copy of the preliminary open space report prepared by Open Space Resources, Inc. is included in Chapter 5, Section 5.3 of this FEIS as an attachment to Letter No. 201, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Jennifer A. Dold). This report further describes the study area boundaries. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 3: Reference to Wiltermood Wetland Report

Your comment regarding a Wiltermood wetland report related to a study task dated 6/5/92 is noted. The wetland report referenced in the Cadwell/Huish Reclassification Request is also by Wiltermood Associates, Inc. and is in the form of a letter dated July 29, 2005. The 2005 letter does not contain the text quoted in the comment, but does state that the site visit was brief and did not include collection of data documenting the absence of wetlands. The information for the reclassification request may be viewed at the Kitsap County Department of Community Development offices.

Response to Comment 4: History of Open Space Current Use Requests

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that it is possible to change the open space tax status of a parcel.

Response to Comment 5: History of Zoning Designations

The comment regarding the Dyes Inlet Preservation Council position on proposed changes to zoning designations in 1996 is noted.

Response to Comment 6: Unclear Zoning Boundary Description

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Legal descriptions, assessor levy boundaries, and plan/zoning maps serve different purposes, and may or may not be consistent based on their intent.

Response to Comment 7: 1999 Open Space Area Report

Your comment regarding the preliminary open space report prepared in 1999 is noted. A copy of this report is included in Chapter 5, Section 5.3 of this FEIS as an attachment to Letter No. 201, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Jennifer A. Dold).

Response to Comment 8: 9506 Mickelberry Road NW [Kenlon] Property Drainage Concerns

The comments regarding stormwater drainage for the property at 9506 Mickellberry Road NW [Kenlon property] are noted. Any future site specific development of this site would be required to comply with applicable Kitsap County stormwater drainage standards, as well as Critical Area Ordinance and Shoreline Management Program requirements.

Response to Comment 9: Opposition to Urban High and Regional Commercial Designations

The comments in opposition to the proposed change in designation of the property at 9506 Mickelberry Road NW [Kenlon property] are noted and forward to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments in opposition to the proposed change in designation of the property immediately north of the property at 9506 Mickelberry Road NW, referred to in the comment letter as the Social Security site, are also noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

The Preferred Alternative would zone the property at 9506 Mickelberry Road NW as Urban High Residential (19 – 30 units/acre) and the Social Security site as Regional Commercial.

Response to Comment 10: 9506 Mickellberry Road NW [Kenlon] Property Rezone Request to Urban High Residential

The statement regarding the request for change in designation to Urban High Residential is noted. The Preferred Alternative would rezone this site to Urban High Residential (19 – 30 units/acre).

Response to Comment 11: Rezone Request to Regional Commercial

The statement regarding the request for change in zoning designation in the area between Mickelberry Road and Tracyton Boulevard along Bucklin Hill Road is noted. With the exception of two parcels at the southwest corner of the intersection of NW Bucklin Hill Road and Tracyton Boulevard NW, the Preferred Alternative would zone the referenced area to Regional Commercial. The two parcels not designated Regional Commercial would retain the Urban High zoning designation.

Response to Comment 12: Opposition to Change in Designation for 9506 Mickelberry Road NW [Kenlon] Property

The opposition to the change in designation for the 9506 Mickelberry Road NW (Kenlon) property is noted. Environmental analysis of the proposed changes has been conducted at a programmatic level. This analysis is documented in Volume II (DEIS) of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update. Impacts associated with the natural environment are discussed in Section 3.1 of the DEIS.

At a site-specific level, County regulations and requirements for identification and protection of critical areas and for stormwater management must be satisfied as part of any future development proposal. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 13: Relationship to Silverdale 2052 Vision Plan

The comment regarding the relationship of the proposed redesignation of the property at 9506 Mickelberry Road NW (Kenlon) to the Silverdale 2052 Vision Plan is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. It should be noted that the Silverdale 2052 Vision Plan has not been adopted by Kitsap County. For more information on goals and policies related to environmental protection, please refer to Volume 1 (Comprehensive Plan Policy Document). Chapter 4 addresses natural systems at a countywide level and Chapter 14 provides additional policies specifically for the Silverdale UGA.

Response to Comment 14: Relationship to Silverdale 2052 Vision Plan

The comment regarding the relationship of the proposed redesignation of the property at 9506 Mickelberry Road NW (Kenlon) to the Silverdale 2052 Vision Plan is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. It should be noted that the Silverdale 2052 Vision Plan has not been adopted by Kitsap County. For more information on goals and policies related to environmental protection, please refer to Volume 1 (Comprehensive Plan Policy Document). Chapter 10 addresses parks, recreation and open space at a countywide level and Chapter 14 provides additional policies specifically for the Silverdale UGA.

Response to Comment 15: TDR

The Preferred Alternative includes policies (Volume I, Chapter 3) and implementing regulations (Volume III), which address TDR. The TDR program would allow rural property owners to sell the development rights from their lands to property owners in the urban growth area wishing to achieve higher residential densities or land use intensity than allowed by the Comprehensive Plan/Zoning Ordinance. This program does not address TDR transfers within the urban growth area, such as between properties within the Silverdale UGA. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 66.

Response to Comment 16: County Review of Proposed Rezone

Environmental review of the proposed reclassification of properties under each of the alternatives is documented in Volume II (DEIS). Natural environment analysis is included in DEIS Chapter 3.1. Review was conducted at a programmatic area-wide basis. At a site-specific level, County regulations and requirements for identification and protection of critical areas and for stormwater management must be satisfied as part of any future development proposal.

Response to Comment 17: Need to Walk Site

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 204 Homebuilder Association (9/20/06; Unnamed)

Response to Comment 1: Countywide Residential Permits in Pipeline

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Future lot creation statistics provides reason for optimism in many areas including densities being created within urban growth areas and the urban/rural split of residential development.

Letter No. 205 Homebuilder Association (10/23/06; Unnamed)

Response to Comment 1: Urban Restricted/Urban Low

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The intent of the Urban Restricted zone is to allow for lower densities within the urban area where there are significant critical areas. To better match the intent of the zone, the proposed regulations would alter the calculation of density (gross acres minus critical areas rather than gross acres). In response to comments the draft regulations associated with Alternative 2 were revised for the Preferred Alternative to retain a range of 1-5 dwelling units per acre rather than 1-4 dwelling units per acre. In addition, Preferred Alternative also adjusts density to be calculated based on gross acres minus critical areas rather than also excluding buffers from the density calculation.

Response to Comment 2: Mixed Use Minimum Densities

The intent of the Mixed Use zone is to encourage higher density development to provide additional housing types and maximize infrastructure improvements. Lowering the minimum density removes the zone's value for these purposes and as a reasonable measure.

Response to Comment 3: Property Rights

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Revision of GMA goals such as those related to property rights is the responsibility of the state legislature. In the Preferred Plan, the goals are intended to be presented as listed in State law.

Response to Comment 4: Low Impact Development Standards

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The policies provide guidance. Specific standards, techniques, incentives, etc. will be determined at the implementation stage when low impact development regulations are prepared. The development regulations will be subject to public review in accordance with County procedures.

Response to Comment 5: Economic Development

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Port of Bremerton's requested policies have been reinstated in the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 6: Broadband Policy

The policy encourages broadband infrastructure in the Utilities Element. The Capital Facilities Element identifies which facilities are subject to concurrency or to adequacy at the time of

development. At this time, broadband infrastructure is not listed in the Capital Facilities Element. The individual service providers requirements to serve may determine where such facilities are implement, as well as any future regulations or incentives that the County may prepare to implement adopted policies.

Response to Comment 7: Shoreline Buffers

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. At this time the County is not making policy amendments in its Shoreline Element. Future update of the Shoreline Master Program is anticipated to be completed in 2011 per State requirements.

Response to Comment 8: 28-Day Preapplication Requirement

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The BOCC changed the time period to 21 days in the final Volume III.

Response to Comment 9: RWIP

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is a pilot program and is intended to be reviewed frequently for course corrections as appropriate.

Response to Comment 10: TDR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The TDR program recommendations by the Planning Commission were approved by the BOCC with some refinements allowing the BOCC to determine if TDR is required for area-wide Comprehensive Plan amendments or Sub-Area Plans.

Response to Comment 11: Transportation Funding Options

The funding sources for transportation infrastructure proposed by the County were listed based upon their ability to fund the necessary infrastructure. The Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) is currently being used to its maximum effectiveness. An increase in sales tax for transportation funding has not been greatly successful in Washington State and an increase in property taxes is considered in the proposals.

Response to Comment 12: Impact Fee Increase

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. At this time, impact fee changes are one of several potential options should the County require additional funding sources. Any future impact fee program increase would be the subject of public review in accordance with County procedures.

Response to Comment 13: Support SEPA Integration

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 206 Illahee Community Citizens Group (9/18/06; Sheeran and Aho)

Response to Comment 1: Alternative Two for East Bremerton & Central Kitsap UGAs

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Responses to Letter No. 6 Comments 1 through 4, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 2: Sunset & East Boulevard Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 3, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 3: Illahee Shoreline Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA zoning of this area as Urban Low Residential (4-9 d.u./acre). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Response to Comment 4: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 5: Kitsap Transit Land Use Reclassification Request

The Kitsap Transit rezone request is located on the corner of McWilliams Road and Highway 303 with an existing zoning of Urban Medium residential (10-19 du/acre). The rezone request proposed Highway Tourist Commercial zoning classification. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA has designated this property as Mixed-Use. This designation is a mix of multi-family housing and commercial uses and is consistent with other zoning along the Highway 303 corridor. To ensure coordination of future trail plans for the Illahee Forest Preserve with any development of this site, it is important to have trail locations finalized and adopted as part of the Parks and Open Space Plan or through the Illahee Community Plan proposed for adoption in 2007/2008.

Response to Comment 6: Community Input

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 207 Illahee Community Citizens Group (9/20/06; Unnamed)

Response to Comment 1: Quit Claim Deed WSDOT

The document is entered as part of the FEIS record.

Letter No. 208 Illahee Community Citizens Group (9/21/06; Unnamed; Rolling Hills)

Response to Comment 1: MyKitsap.org Website

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Alternative 2 and its associated consolidated comprehensive plan and zoning map was included as Figures 2-1, -2, -3, -4 of Volume I: Draft Comprehensive Plan Policy Document. This document and related figures was issued and posted on the MyKitsap.org website on August 29, 2006. Due to public requests for UGA specific maps of the alternatives, including the figures noted above, the County created UGA detailed maps of the proposed comprehensive plan consolidation and associated zoning of Alternative two. These maps were posted on the MyKitsap.org website on September 11, 2006.

Response to Comment 2: Rolling Hills Golf Course Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA includes the Rolling Hills Golf Course as Urban Reserve (1 du/ 10 acres). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Response to Comment 3: Stormwater Mitigation

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Any future development of the site would have to satisfy County regulations for stormwater management and critical areas identification and protection.

Response to Comment 4: Future Uses & Impacts of the Rolling Hills Golf Course

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 4, Port of Illahee.

Letter No. 209 Illahee Community Citizens Group (9/25/06; Sheeran and Aho)

Response to Comment 1: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 2: Timbers' Edge Development Proposal

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative zones this area as Urban Restricted (1-5 d.u./acre). Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 3: Illahee Watershed

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Open Space

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 210 Illahee Community Citizens Group (9/27/06)

Response to Comment 1: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 2: Timbers' Edge Development Proposal

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative zones this area as Urban Restricted (1-5 du/ac). Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 3: Illahee Watershed

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Open Space

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 211 Illahee Community Citizens Group (10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Rolling Hills Golf Course Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 4, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 2: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Letter No. 212 Illahee Forest Preserve (10/23/06; Judith Krigsman)

Response to Comment 1: Kitsap Transit Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 206 Comment 5, Jim Aho and Dennis Sheeran.

Response to Comment 2: Sprawl Development

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: July 10, 2006 City of Bremerton Comments

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Letter No. 1 submitted by the City of Bremerton during the 10-Year Update 60-day review.

Response to Comment 4: Kitsap Transit Remain Public Facility

The Preferred Alternative Comprehensive Plan Map designates Kitsap Transit's property along Highway 303 as Public Facility, with an underlying zoning classification of Mixed-Use. Public facilities uses are allowed in almost zoning classifications. Sale of this property from public ownership would have to be approved by the Kitsap Transit Board of Commissioners and Washington State Department of Transportation. This course of action would have to adhere to statutory requirements of public notification and approval of the land transaction.

Response to Comment 5: Illahee Preserve Western Boundary

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Planning & Vision for the Illahee Community

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 7: Kitsap Transit Land Use Reclassification Request

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 213 Illahee Forest Preserve (10/25/06; Eugene Brennan)

Response to Comment 1: Rolling Hills Golf Course Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does include the Rolling Hills Golf Course as Urban Reserve (1 d.u./ 10 acres). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Response to Comment 2: City & County Joint Planning Efforts

Please see Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 3: No Zoning Change for Golf Course

Please see Response to Comment 1.

Letter No. 214 Illahee Forest Preserve (10/30/06; Jim Aho)

Response to Comment 1: Fir Drive Zoning

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 6 Comment 2, Port of Illahee.

Response to Comment 2: Citizen Support for Lower Densities for Fir Drive

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Rezone Supports Illahee Creek Restoration Efforts

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 215 Illahee Forest Preserve, Illahee Forest Stewardship Committee, and Illahee Community Citizens Group (10/30/06; Boyle, Krigsman; and Aho)

Response to Comment 1: Representing the Illahee Forest Stewardship & Illahee Community Citizens Group

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Kitsap Transit Land Use Reclassification Request

The Kitsap Transit rezone request is located on the corner of McWilliams Road and Highway 303 with an existing zoning of Urban Medium residential (10-19 d.u./acre). The rezone request proposed Highway Tourist Commercial. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA has designated this property as mixed use. This designation is a mix of multi-family housing and commercial uses and is consistent with other zoning along the Highway 303 corridor. To ensure coordination of future trail plans for the Illahee Forest with any development of this site, it is important to have these trail locations finalized and adopted as part of the Parks and Open Space Plan or through the Illahee Community Plan proposed for adoption in 2007/2008.

Response to Comment 3: Illahee Forest Entry Signage

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Citizens Input

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Deny Kitsap Transit Rezone Request

Please see Response to Comment 2.

Letter No. 216 Illahee Forest Stewardship Committee (9/24/06; Judith Krigsman)

Response to Comment 1: DNR Transfer to DOT, Park and Ride Property

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Kitsap Transit LURR Filed

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 3: Kitsap Transit Letter and Intent to Surplus

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 1, Letter No. 75, Judith Krigsman.

Response to Comment 4: Contact with DOT Staff

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Maintain Park and Ride Lot As Is

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Kitsap Transit Request Does Not Acknowledge Environment

The Kitsap Transit request was studied in a programmatic, cumulative fashion in the DEIS along with other reclassification requests. Programmatic mitigation measures are included. In addition, County critical area regulations would continue to apply. Site-specific development would be subject to SEPA review if exceeding categorical exemption thresholds.

Letter No. 217 Johnson Creek Association (9/26/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support Alternative 1: Multiple Critical Areas on Johnson Property

The preference for Alternative 1 is noted and forwarded to decision-makers. The BOCC decision was to approve Alternative 2 subject to City of Poulsbo approval. The City of Poulsbo City Council did not agree on Alternative 2. Therefore Alternative 1 is retained in this UGA.

Please note that the Poulsbo UGA population allocation is not met with Alternative 1 (-226), but comes closer with Alternative 2 (-34). The FEIS identifies that further coordination between the City and the County is needed to address the population allocation shortfall with the application of Alternative 1 as part of the Preferred Alternative. Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS Section 3.2.3 for UGAs not meeting targets include population allocation banking or shifting population between UGAs that have greater potential to be densified or expanded to accommodate population, additional reasonable measures to increase densities, or UGA expansions, as appropriate. It is likely that the County and City will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding regarding a process to determine how to resolve the population target, land use, UGA boundaries, etc.

County critical areas mapping identifies a Moderate Geologic Hazard Area in the southeast corner of the property. However, critical areas regulations are applied on the basis of actual site-specific conditions. Mapping is updated over time as information is collected based on newer inventories or site-specific investigations.

Response to Comment 2: Rezone Abutting SR-3 for Light Industrial In Creek Watershed

The preference for non-industrial zoning is noted and forwarded to decision-makers. The site abuts park and public uses to the north, as well as the highway to the east/south; residential uses lie to the west. County critical areas mapping identifies potential wetlands. Critical aquifer mapping appears to indicate a Category 2 aquifer. Future development on the property would need to meet applicable critical area and environmental regulations as well as setbacks, landscaping and other requirements.

Response to Comment 3: Place Wildlife Corridor around Johnson Creek

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the County Critical Areas Ordinance addresses fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. City critical areas regulations are in process.

Response to Comment 4: Request to be Removed from UGA

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The reclassification request was filed after the April 10, 2006 deadline established for the 10-Year Update.

Poulsbo UGA boundaries were established in the vicinity of the subject properties in the Poulsbo Sub-Area Plan in 2001 and represented the outcome of the citizen input at that time, and the ability of the City to serve the area in the future. Inclusion in the UGA does not require property owners to develop, and property owners may maintain their present uses.

Response to Comment 5: Interconnected Corridors

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the County Critical Areas Ordinance addresses fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. City critical areas regulations are in process at the time of this writing.

Response to Comment 6: Consistent Critical Area Standards

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 5.

Letter No. 218 Johnson Creek Association (10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Plan at Watershed Level

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Responses to the Association's September 25, 2006 letter are provided above in Response to Letter No. 217. Responses to testimony made at the County public hearing on September 21, 2006 are found in Section 5.4 below. The letters to the City of Poulsbo regarding their critical areas ordinance are made part of the FEIS record.

Letter No. 219 Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners (9/27/06; Unnamed)

Response to Comment 1: Consistency with Countywide Planning Policies

The Countywide Planning Policies for Kitsap County incorporate the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Vision. With the County's 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update the vision statement has been modified and is not identical to the 1998 Plan. However, it updates the vision in a manner that preserves the essential concepts of the 1998 Plan vision. GMA requires consistency. The State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development interprets the word consistency as follows: "...In general, the phrase 'not incompatible with' conveys the meaning of 'consistency' most suited to preserving flexibility for local variations... Determining consistency in this inter-jurisdictional context is complicated by the differences in timing which will occur in the adoption of plans..." See WAC 365-195-070 (7). Minor variations are anticipated in the interpretation as are differences in timing of adoption. The County's updated Vision is not incompatible with its 1998 Vision Statement that is a part of the Countywide Planning Policies. Further the Countywide Planning Policies may be amended to fully incorporate the revised County plan vision.

Response to Comment 2: Vision Statement Priorities

Similar to GMA goals (RCW 36.70A.020), the County's Vision elements are not prioritized. The preamble to the vision bullets indicates the idea of balance: "While the themes are each described individually, taken as a whole, the vision speaks to the idea of balance between the public welfare and private property rights."

Response to Comment 3: Vision and Private Property Rights

The first vision bullet indicates in part "to meet collective needs fairly while respecting individual and property rights."

Response to Comment 4: GMA Goal Regarding Permits

The Vision bullet regarding County government indicates:

"County government that is accountable and accessible; encourages citizen participation; seeks to operate as efficiently as possible; and works with citizens, governmental entities and Tribes to meet collective needs fairly while respecting individual and property rights."

The GMA Goal on permits states:

"Applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability. (RCW 36.70A.020(7))"

The vision and GMA goal are compatible in that the County's intent to operate efficiently and be accountable, accessible would be inclusive of processing permits in a timely and fair manner. In addition, see policies ED-9 and HS-16 and HS-17, which promote streamlined regulatory processes.

Response to Comment 5: Natural Environment Vision

The County considered citizen input in the Visioning process that occurred in Spring 2006. The revised Natural Environment vision statement is intended to show a balance of natural environment protection and development and is consistent with GMA goals to protect environmental quality (e.g. air and water) and critical areas.

Response to Comment 6: Housing Vision

The Housing vision bullet promotes a variety of residential housing types that are well served:

“Residential communities that are attractive, affordable, diverse, and livable supported by appropriate urban or rural services. A variety of housing choices are available, meeting a full range of resident income levels and preferences. Residents are able to walk between neighborhoods and to community destinations.”

Citizen input during the visioning process in Spring 2006 resulted in comments regarding the need to walk between neighborhoods and destinations. The concept was found in the prior vision statement in terms of centers, etc.

The Housing vision bullet does not limit the County’s ability to provide for necessary transportation facilities to meet the varied travel and employment needs of the community – see the Transportation bullet which focuses on all transportation modes:

“An efficient, flexible, and coordinated multi-modal transportation system—including roads, bridges and highways, ferries, transit, and non-motorized travel—that provides interconnectivity and mobility for county residents and supports our urban and rural land use pattern.”

Response to Comment 7: Rural Vision

The Rural vision bullet is similar to the current vision statement with some amendments based on citizen input to reflect resource activities and rural recreation:

“Rural areas and communities where unique historical characters, appearances, functions, and pioneering spirits are retained and enhanced. Natural resource activities, such as forestry, agriculture, and mining continue to contribute to the rural character and economy. Rural recreation opportunities are enhanced, including equestrian facilities, trails, and others.”

Rural character depends on the location in the County. The Port Gamble historic character is not the same as the historic character of other rural communities. Growth in rural areas will continue to be guided by Comprehensive Plan policies and development regulations.

Response to Comment 8: Cultural Resources

The Cultural Resources vision bullet states:

“Historical and archaeological resources that are recognized and preserved for future generations.”

Protection of cultural resources is included in a similar GMA goal:

Identify and encourage the preservation of lands, sites, and structures, which have historical or archaeological significance. (RCW 36.70A.020(13))

Please see Section 3.2.4 of the DEIS which describes cultural resources and the federal, state, and local laws and agencies that are involved in their protection.

Response to Comment 9: Economic Development

The vision bullet on economic development states:

“A stable, prosperous and diversified economy that provides living wage jobs for residents, supported by adequate land for a range of employment uses and that encourages accomplishment of local economic development goals.”

“Local economic development goals” is broad, and would mean that the County plans and programs may differ in different parts of the County. For example, County plans promote both regional commercial and some industrial activities in Silverdale, but focuses on industrial type uses in the South Kitsap Industrial Area.

Response to Comment 10: Public Facilities Vision

The County is required by GMA to coordinate with other local governments and service providers; see GMA requirements to prepare a capital facilities plan element addressing all facilities owned by public agencies and the utilities element that is to address power and telecommunication utilities (RCW 36.70A.070). Therefore the County’s vision references working with partner agencies:

“Public services and facilities—including, but not limited to, parks and recreation, law enforcement, fire protection, emergency preparedness, water/sewer, roads, transit, nonmotorized facilities, ferries, stormwater management, education, library services, health and human services, energy, telecommunications, etc.—are provided in an efficient, high-quality and timely manner by the County and its partner agencies. Public services and facilities are monitored, maintained and enhanced to meet quality service standards.”

Response to Comment 11: Description of Plan

The Introduction chapter, similar to the 1998 Plan Introduction, notes that the Plan is a “vehicle” or a management tool to help achieve its vision of the future. The Plan includes all of the required elements and addresses GMA goals in order to be consistent with GMA. As provided in state rules, providing a plan that meets GMA goals and a community’s vision is important: “...Comprehensive plans must show how each of the goals is to be pursued consistent with the planning entity's vision of its future.” (WAC 365-195-070 (1))

Response to Comment 12: Consistency with the Plan

The Plan introduction conveys the importance in consistency of the County’s decision-making with the plan:

“...Kitsap County's regulatory and non-regulatory decisions and programs, as well as its budget, should be consistent with the Plan. Used this way, the Plan minimizes conflict in decision making, promotes coordination among programs and regulations, brings predictability to the development process, and increases effectiveness of County efforts to improve citizens’ quality of life. Individual landowners and interest groups are able to use the Plan to evaluate their decisions in light of the community's goals...”

The section is meant to be directional rather than a quote of state law.

The County planning and capital facility decisions will need to be consistent with the plan pursuant to RCW 36.70A.120, as well as with other State laws.

Response to Comment 13: Vision 2020

As noted on the PSRC website (<http://www.psrc.org/about/what/faq.htm>, accessed November 4, 2006) “Federal laws require the establishment of Metropolitan Planning Organizations in major metropolitan areas around the country, to work on regional transportation issues. Each of the four counties—King, Kitsap, Pierce and Snohomish—are required to be members of an MPO... State laws establish Regional Transportation Planning Organizations (RTPOs) to work on growth management as well as transportation issues, and require that the Regional Council include as members two state agencies—the Washington State Department of Transportation and the State Transportation Commission—as well as the ports of Everett, Seattle, and Tacoma. RTPOs are similar to MPOs for large urban areas, but also include rural areas.”

The Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan indicates its plan “considers the growth policies” of Vision 2020 and Destination 2030, which are planning documents that are produced in an intergovernmental manner through the PSRC to meet its directives under the federal and state laws.

Response to Comment 14: GMA Goals and Their Use

The comments are noted. For purposes of clarity the Preferred Alternative Plan amends the lead in statement prior to the GMA goals to read as follows:

The GMA established 13 goals for the comprehensive planning process. Per RCW 36.70A.020, “the following goals are not listed in order of priority and shall be used exclusively for the purpose of guiding the development of comprehensive plans and development regulations”:

Response to Comment 15: GMA Key Requirements

The paragraph under Section 1.3.1 regarding key requirements is similar to language in the adopted 1998 Comprehensive Plan. All of the listed requirements are consistent with GMA. The requirement to document capital facility needs/costs as well as to establish levels of service and

reassess land use if services cannot be provided is found in RCW 36.70A.070(3) and (6). The requirement to comprehensively look at land use, housing, transportation, capital facilities and utilities is found in the requirements for each plan element in RCW 36.70A.070. Internal and external plan consistency/coordination is required in RCW 36.70A.070 and 100.

Response to Comment 16: GMA Goals Non-Prioritized

Please see Response to Comment 14. Revision of GMA goals such as those related to property rights is the responsibility of the state legislature. The goals are intended to be presented as listed in State law.

Response to Comment 17: Countywide Planning Policy Contents

The comments are noted. The text describing the Countywide Planning Policies is carried forward from the 1998 Plan. For purposes of clarity the lead in sentence to the description of topics covered by the Countywide Planning Policies is amended to read as follows:

~~Specific objectives of~~ The CPPs address thirteen elements, and topics addressed include, but are not limited to:

Response to Comment 18: PSRC and Citizen Participation

PSRC's citizen participation efforts are included in its regional planning efforts, and also is guided by elected representatives from around the region. Review of the PSRC website may be made at: www.psrc.org. Please see Response to Comment 13.

Response to Comment 19: Salmon Recovery

The section describing federal and state acts is meant to be a summary of the coordinated planning efforts within which the County participates. Relevant inventory and similar information was referenced in the DEIS Section 3.1.

Please see the County website (<http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/nr/nr.htm>) and refer to County Natural Resources staff for more information.

Response to Comment 20: WRIA 15 Watershed Management Plan

Section 1.3.4 of the Plan Introduction notes that the listed programs and documents are *non-regulatory* including the Kitsap Peninsula (Water Resources Inventory Area [WRIA] 15) Watershed Management Plan. Although the final watershed plan was vetoed, the planning process produced several reports and studies regarding water resources in WRIA 15 that can serve as resources for planning in Kitsap County. The Washington State Department of Ecology notes that many of the watershed related recommendations are being implemented by various parties independent of the watershed planning process, such as, actions related to water reuse, stormwater management, and water supply. (See <http://www.ecy.wa.gov/apps/watersheds/planning/15.html>, accessed November 29, 2006).

Response to Comment 21: Public Participation

Volume I, Section 1.4 documents the public participation activities, which exceeded the minimum required by GMA. A 60-day comment period was established for the draft documents, and four public hearings were held, in addition to the public workshops. The public participation opportunities were described and made available to the public at the MyKitsap.org website. Prior to the September public hearings a mailing describing the hearings and ability to comment were prepared and mailed to over 30,000 property owners. See also FEIS Appendix A.

Response to Comment 22: Cross References to Existing Plan

The Draft Plan provided references to original policies in parentheses after each policy, and it included tables identifying dropped policies.

Response to Comment 23: Length of Documents

Comments regarding the length of the draft documents are noted. The Plan Update consists of an integrated plan and EIS as well as development regulations. It also integrates the existing and proposed sub-area plans. The integrated documents provide a single place to view the plans/policies that the County has adopted/updated in once place. Summaries and introductions are included in each volume to help guide the reader to their areas of greatest interest.

The 1998 Comprehensive Plan (Volumes I and II) as well as the Sub-Area Plans that amended it between 1998 and 2005 total approximately 2,000 pages, excluding the original Comprehensive Plan EIS documents, which would add pages to a comparable level as the current update.

Portions of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update have been available prior to the full plan issuance including, but not limited to, the Vision Statement Review (March 2006), all of the existing subarea plans adopted between 1998 and 2005, the proposed Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan (May 2006), Order of Magnitude Analysis (June 2006), Land Use Reclassification Request Evaluation (May 2006, updated in August 2006), and Land Use Alternative iterations (May through July 2006).

The 10-Year Update volumes were made available at public libraries, County offices, and were for sale on compact disk or as hard copies.

Response to Comment 24: Ability to Comment

A 60-day comment period for written comments was established beginning on August 29, 2006. Open houses were held to introduce the draft documents in August and September. The first three hearings occurred approximately three weeks after the document issuance. Further, seven weeks after the documents were issued a fourth public hearing was held and continued later that week as well.

Response to Comment 25: Silverdale Population Allocation

All of the UGA population allocations in the Countywide Planning Policies are based on a range of the Year 2000 to 2025. This 25-year time frame is longer than the 20-year timeframe for which a community may plan under the GMA, but allows for a comparison from the Year 2000

Census. Therefore, Countywide Planning Policy population targets were adjusted to account for growth from 2005 to 2025, rather than the 2000 to 2025 period for which the targets were adopted. The target established in 2000 was adjusted for this analysis to account for growth that occurred from 2000 to 2004. Adjustments assumed a constant rate of growth from 2000 to 2025. At the Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee meeting dated June 8, 2006, the need to adjust the target to reflect 20 years of growth was discussed.

The information was included in the Order of Magnitude Analysis in June 2006 and is also explained in the DEIS Chapter 2 where tables show the 25 year projection and the 20 year adjusted projection.

Response to Comment 26: Silverdale Alternatives Boundaries

Alternatives were prepared by staff following direction from the Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee about priority growth areas. The Advisory Committee reviewed and made recommendations regarding the draft alternatives. The Silverdale Citizens Advisory recommended a preferred alternative on June 8 and 29, 2006 and is represented as Alternative 2-A.

Response to Comment 27: Reclassifications Review

In addition to the February 2006 Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee meeting at which proponents presented their reclassification requests, there were public comment opportunities at each Committee meeting. The Land Use Reclassification Requests were evaluated through the 10-Year Update in May and August 2006 and the analysis was made available to the Committee. The Committee's recommendations are largely reflected in DEIS Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative. With the Preferred Alternative, all Silverdale UGA boundary requests are included, and two requests within the existing UGA boundary were not changed from Industrial to Residential. The request to expand the adjacent Central Kitsap UGA is not included in the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 28: Notification Near Reclassification Requests

The 10-Year Update included wide notification of the draft plan release. During mid-August 2006, thirty-two thousand mailings were sent to property owners within and adjacent to the land use alternatives. The mailing included information on the document release, comment opportunities, and dates of the open houses and upcoming public hearings.

Response to Comment 29: Advisory Committee Agendas

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 30: Land Use Element Section 2.1

Each Element includes a table at the beginning of the chapter to reference its relationship to the vision. Reference to Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas was included in the Draft Plan based on text found in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element as the GMA indicates the land use element should address water related issues. However the Preferred Alternative eliminates the

text regarding Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas since it is predominantly covered in the Natural Systems Element. The Land Use Element addresses reasonable measures a topic addressed in the GMA at RCW 36.70A.215. See Land Use Element section 2.2.3 for more information.

Response to Comment 31: Directing Bulk of Growth to UGAs

As noted in Chapter 2 of the DEIS, most new population (approximately 76%) is expected to occur within UGA boundaries based on the Countywide Planning Policy allocations of new growth. This projected growth reflects a greater percentage of the population residing in urban areas than was the case in 2000, when 58% of the population resided in urban areas (Kitsap County CPPs 2004). Therefore the bulk of the growth is directed to urban areas.

Response to Comment 32: Distinction between Urban and Rural Areas

GMA goals encourage growth in urban areas and require reducing sprawl – this latter goal is restated in the requirements of Rural Elements of comprehensive plans.

Additionally, the Countywide Planning Policies direct most new growth to urban areas and less to rural areas as described in Response to Comment 31. In Kitsap County the 2002 Buildable Lands Report noted "...a central issue concerning rural development is that much of it occurs on [already platted] parcels that are smaller than the prescribed density standard...Until these... 'legacy lots' are fully absorbed, the County may face some obstacles in its efforts to direct most of the new growth towards urban areas". Therefore, distinguishing rural and urban areas has been a concern in the past in the County attempts to meet GMA goals and Countywide Planning Policies.

The County may amend its Comprehensive Plan no more frequently than once a year, and has the ability to do comprehensive reviews at seven and 10 years and may amend UGA boundaries in order to accommodate additional population allocations or new employment circumstances.

Response to Comment 33: Employment Locations

The estimate of jobs for each DEIS alternatives is generally based on the location and capacity of buildable acres. Most of the buildable acres are in the UGAs. About 10% of the countywide employment projection was assumed to occur in rural areas based on current rural industrial and rural commercial capacity. See DEIS Appendix E for more information on the calculation of employment forecasts and FEIS Appendix C for the estimate of employment capacity for the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 34: Map Scale

The Draft Comprehensive Plan includes 11 x 17 inch maps of the Countywide Plan and zoning split into north and south maps. Parcels are shown on the countywide maps. Likewise for the subarea chapters, close-up views of the relevant areas were provided for plan and zoning classifications, and included parcels on the zoning map. The maps were made available online in a PDF format, and the Adobe Reader program includes a zoom feature. Larger scale maps were provided at the public meetings. Maps of different scales are available by contacting the Kitsap County Department of Community Development.

Response to Comment 35: Policy LU-1 Population Numbers

GMA requires that Land Use Element provide “estimates of future population growth” (RCW 36.70A.070(1)). The Preferred Alternative includes an updated population table to reflect the final plan. If the Countywide Planning Policies allocation numbers are updated in the future the County can amend its plan accordingly as part of annual or periodic comprehensive reviews.

Response to Comment 36: Policy LU-3 Population Numbers

Please see Response to Comment 35.

Response to Comment 37: Policy LU-4 and Tribes

The tribes participate in and are members of the KRCC although they are not assigned a population allocation. As members of this KRCC, the policy includes references to the tribes.

Response to Comment 38: Table 2-1 with Population

Please see Response to Comment 35.

Response to Comment 39: Quality of Life in Policy LU-5

In accordance with Planning Commission recommendations, Policy LU-5 was modified by the BOCC to exclude the phrase quality of life in the Preferred Plan. The Planning Commission findings indicated that they felt that quality of life indicators was too general a term and there was a question as to how it would be monitored.

Response to Comment 40: Policy LU-7 and Evaluation

The word evaluation is meant to indicate that the County intends to review/examine and assess the assumptions in the Updated Land Capacity Analysis annually. If the analysis method needs fine-tuning as a result of the annual review, adjustments can be made.

Response to Comment 41: Implementation of Reasonable Measures

RCW 36.70A.215 indicates in part “[i]f the evaluation required by subsection (3) of this section demonstrates an inconsistency between what has occurred since the adoption of the county-wide planning policies and the county and city comprehensive plans and development regulations and what was envisioned in those policies and plans and the planning goals and the requirements of this chapter, as the inconsistency relates to the evaluation factors specified in subsection (3) of this section, the county and its cities shall adopt and implement measures that are reasonably likely to increase consistency during the subsequent five-year period.”

DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C provides a summary of the 2002 Buildable Lands Report and more recent preliminary monitoring. As noted in the DEIS and the Draft Plan, the 2002 BLR indicated that in some cases, urban densities were not being achieved within certain UGAs. However, the report noted that the analysis period of 1995-1999 would have only addressed one year of growth under the approved 1998 Plan. The CPSGMHB has held that the 2002 BLR identified an inconsistency between “planned” and “actual” development patterns in that more growth was occurring in rural areas than was targeted in the CPPs. This issue is on appeal.

Preliminary growth monitoring indicates that between 2000 and 2005 Urban Low Residential plats in total achieved an average of 5.6 units/net acre which is within the Urban Low Residential density range, although this average was not uniformly achieved in all UGAs. Adjusting zoning allowances as well as improving the availability of urban public services could help the achievement of density goals throughout urban areas, as suggested by the CPSGMHB. Therefore, additional reasonable measures are proposed as part of the 10-Year Update.

Response to Comment 42: Reasonable Measures and Why Necessary

Please see Response to Comment 41, as well as DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C regarding reasonable measures.

Response to Comment 43: Policy LU-8 and Validation

The word evaluation is meant to indicate that the County intends to review/examine and assess growth and how it relates to Plan assumptions. If assumptions are not matching the observed growth, adjustments to the Plan or implementing regulations may be made.

Response to Comment 44: Policy LU-9 and Urban Growth in Rural Areas

Please see Response to Comment 32.

Response to Comment 45: Policy LU-10 and Reasonable Measures

Please see Response to Comment 41.

Response to Comment 46: Policy LU-11 Evaluation

GMA requires a buildable lands evaluation every five years per RCW 36.70A.215. Section 2.2.3 in Volume I Chapter 2 describes the next report is due in 2007.

Response to Comment 47: Most Growth in UGAs

To clarify the growth allocations further, the first sentence of Section 2.2.4 is amended in the Preferred Alternative Plan as follows:

According to GMA goals growth is to be encouraged in urban areas, and the CPP allocates; most growth ~~should be accommodated~~ within ~~designated~~ UGAs.

Response to Comment 48: Silverdale Advisory Committee Alternative 2A

The BOCC determined the make up of the Alternatives to be tested in the DEIS. The BOCC reviewed the Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee recommendations or “Alternative 2A” in July, and on July 12th, following the July 10th, public hearing directed a revised Alternative 2 be included in the DEIS. The DEIS Alternative differs from Alternative 2A in that it excluded the Barker Creek Corridor from the UGA and provided lower-density residential (Urban Restricted) for lands along the Chico estuary. The Draft Plan was developed around Alternative 2 as the BOCC directed in July following review of the Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee recommendations.

Response to Comment 49: Silverdale Regional Growth Center Boundaries

The DEIS in Chapter 2 and the Draft Plan in Chapter 14 included a map with the regional growth center boundaries. A similar map is included in the Preferred Alternative Plan.

Response to Comment 50: Illahee Community Planning Efforts

Draft Plan Chapter 17 (and the same in the Preferred Plan) addresses the Illahee community area. Additionally within the limits of GMA, most of the Illahee community requests for land use classifications/zoning were accommodated in the Preferred Alternative Land Use Plan. The Illahee Community Plan draft is under refinement by community member and can be considered for integration in a future Plan amendment process such as in 2007.

Response to Comment 51: Policy LU-13 and Population Re-distribution

The Preferred Plan includes “population banking” particularly related to the Central Kitsap, West Bremerton and East Bremerton UGAs. It is expected that the full accommodation of population can be achieved either through the UGAMA process or by reallocating to another UGA. Because population allocations are identified by each UGA in the Countywide Planning Policies, reference to the KRCC is made. Any future adjustments would require an amendment to the Countywide Planning Policies.

Response to Comment 52: Policy LU-14 Equivalent Wastewater Service

According to GMA, urban governmental services include “those public services and public facilities at an intensity historically and typically provided in cities, specifically including storm and sanitary sewer systems, ... and other public utilities associated with urban areas and normally not associated with rural areas.” Alternative sewer technologies are becoming available and have the potential to help achieve urban densities in urban areas. Therefore, such alternative systems are promoted in the plan policies.

Response to Comment 53: Policy LU-15 and Advanced Technology

Sewer service is typically associated with urban areas per the definition of urban governmental services in RCW 36.70A.030. Alternative technologies have been applied in other communities, and their experiences will be considered as implementing programs or regulations are prepared.

Response to Comment 54: Policy LU-16 and Agency for Alternative Systems

Please see responses to comments 41, 52 and 53. Currently the County is a regional sewer treatment provider. The potential for the County to be an agency for long-term monitoring and maintenance of such facilities is appropriate to consider given the County’s current role. This role is similar to the role the County plays in terms of stormwater utility management.

Response to Comment 55: Policy LU-17 and Tax Revenues

Prioritizing UGAs for Kitsap County expenditures for public services and facilities as a tool to encourage development is a reasonable measure similar to the menu of reasonable measures developed by the KRCC. See DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C. UGAs are the areas proposed for the most concentration of growth according to the Countywide Planning Policies.

Response to Comment 56: Policy LU-18 and Limits of Service to Rural Areas

Policy LU-18 is consistent with GMA provisions. Per RCW 36.70A.030(17), “[r]ural governmental services’ or ‘rural services’ include those public services and public facilities historically and typically delivered at an intensity usually found in rural areas, and may include domestic water systems, fire and police protection services, transportation and public transit services, and other public utilities associated with rural development and normally not associated with urban areas. Rural services do not include storm or sanitary sewers, except as otherwise authorized by RCW 36.70A.110(4).” RCW 36.70A.110(4) further indicates “[i]n general, it is not appropriate that urban governmental services be extended to or expanded in rural areas except in those limited circumstances shown to be necessary to protect basic public health and safety and the environment and when such services are financially supportable at rural densities and do not permit urban development.”

Response to Comment 57: Policy LU-19 and Budgeting

Please see Response to Comment 15.

Response to Comment 58: Policy LU-20 and Compact Development

Compact development is intended to mean forms of development that efficiently use land. Examples of these forms include mixed uses, townhomes, cluster development, etc. such as described in Draft Plan Policies LU-45 and 64 that were carried forward as well in the Preferred Alternative Plan (renumbered as necessary).

Response to Comment 59: Policy LU-21 and Infill

The Updated Land Capacity Analysis includes a market assumption that not all property owners would want to develop in the 20-year planning period. However, properties with access to urban services may be attractive for redevelopment or new development.

Response to Comment 60: Policy LU-22 and Employment Locations

See Response to Comment 6. Also, recent GMA amendments (RCW 36.70A.030) that encourage plans to address physical activity support this policy.

Response to Comment 61: Policy LU-23 and Transit

The GMA goal for transportation and transportation element content requirements direct the County to consider multiple modes of travel including transit. Kitsap Transit’s primary service area includes the Preferred Alternative UGA lands. As growth continues, particularly in cities and in County urban centers such as Silverdale, transit services may improve.

Response to Comment 62: Policy LU-24 and Sub-Area Plan Consistency

Policy LU-24 indicates that subarea plan policies are to be integrated into the 10-Year Update. This is accomplished in Chapters 12 to 16 of the Draft and Preferred Plans. In the future, additional Sub-Area/community plans are anticipated such as for Illahee and Keyport. At that time, the policies for the subarea can be integrated. Whether integrated or not, sub-area plans are considered an element of the Comprehensive Plan and must be internally consistent. If

inconsistencies are found policies may be amended as appropriate in future plan review and amendment cycles.

Response to Comment 63: Policy LU-25 and Prior Sub-Area Plan Background Data

Prior subarea plan background data was considered in the 10-Year Update EIS and policies were integrated into Plan Chapters. However, planning efforts in the future may benefit from the prior subarea plan technical analysis or planning process documentation as it was detailed for a particular location. Therefore, Policy LU-25 indicates that such information may be used for reference purposes.

Response to Comment 64: Policies LU-27 and 28 and County Jurisdiction

The UGAMA process is specified in the Countywide Planning Policies. GMA does anticipate that urban areas will ultimately be served by cities. See RCW 36.70A.110 for example. The UGAMA process is to include citizen participation.

Letter No. 220 Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners (10/30/06)

Response to Comment 1: Plan is Impossible Task

See Response to Letter No. 219 Comment 23, Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners.

Response to Comment 2: Two Housing Choices – Rural or High Rise

The Comprehensive Plan promotes single family housing in UGAs as well as medium and high density. The Preferred Alternative has the greatest housing variety at 25% multifamily dwellings, more than other alternatives studied. The Preferred Alternative would allow 75% of the dwellings in the 4-9 du/acre range consisting of single-family dwellings.

Response to Comment 3: Inflated Housing Market

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The ability of each Alternative to supply projected housing needs across the range of incomes is addressed in DEIS/FEIS Section 3.2.3. The Preferred Alternative, similar to Alternative 2, provides for greater housing variety to promote affordability to a range of economic segments.

Response to Comment 4: Closing; Submitting Attachments

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Please note the following regarding attached documents:

- Soundoff Column, October 28, 2006. This is included in the FEIS record.
- Planning Commission Minority Report, October 23, 2006. The letter prepared by Planning Commission Member Michael Gustavson is included in the Response to Comments in Section 5.2.3, Letters Nos. 124 and 125.
- Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners Testimony September 2006 is provided responses to comments above in Letter No. 219, received September 27, 2006.

- Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners Letter dated July 24, 2006 is provided responses in comments numbered 5 to 9 below.
- Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners Testimony on Draft Comprehensive Plan 10 Yr Update, June 2006 is provided responses in comments numbered 10 to 12 below.

Response to Comment 5: Rural Wooded Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Comment 19, Letter No. 10, under the Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development Department.

Response to Comment 6: TDR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. In an effort to meet urban growth accommodation targets and to provide viable economic development options to rural landowners other than the residential development of their land, Kitsap County has developed a TDR program. It will allow property owner to property owner transfers to avoid a labor-intensive government program.

Response to Comment 7: Vision Statements and Countywide Planning Policy Amendments

See Response to Letter No. 219 Comment 1 under the Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners.

Response to Comment 8: Create Realistic Vision Statements

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The County considered citizen input in the Visioning process that occurred in Spring 2006. The development of revised Vision statements is documented in “Proposed Vision Statement Refinements” dated May 12, 2006. That document, available at MyKitsap.org, reviews GMA goals as well. The Vision statement in the 1998 Plan was refined but the overall direction still retained. The Preferred Alternative Vision Statement is compatible with GMA.

Response to Comment 9: Vision Statements Offered

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 10: Meaningful Review; Interrelationship of Plans

The County considered what revisions would be necessary or desired in the document “Task Prioritization Analysis” dated March 9, 2006. This document was made available on MyKitsap.org. A review of consistency with the Countywide Planning Policies is found in DEIS Section 3.2.2 and in DEIS Appendix I. See also FEIS Section 3.2.2 for the Preferred Alternative review.

Response to Comment 11: UGA Boundaries Not Well Considered

The adopted 1998 plan did not include UGA specific population allocations. The ability of Alternative 1 to meet the new population allocations identified in the Countywide Planning

Policies is addressed in the DEIS Chapter 2 and Section 3.2.3. Also addressed in the DEIS and Draft Plan is Alternative 2 with a minimum density of 4 du/ac which is consistent with CPSGMHB decisions applicable to Kitsap County. Mixed use designations are one of several classifications in the 10-Year Update and the County's planning efforts does not solely rely on it.

Response to Comment 12: Do Not Incorporate Sub-Area Plans

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The integrated documents provide a single place to view the plans/policies that the County has adopted/updated in once place. This allows for greater ability to maintain consistency among chapters.

Response to Comment 13: Creation of Alternatives Occurring without Citizen Input

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The County's intent was to provide a process incorporating the diverse opinions of citizens.

Alternatives for the 10-Year Update were developed with citizen input at three public workshops in May 2006; see the document summarizing those meetings titled "Alternatives Workshop Meeting Summary" May 2006 made available on MyKitsap.org. In addition a public hearing was held on July 10, 2006.

A coordinated effort to advertise and receive land use reclassification requests was held in 2005 for Kingston, Silverdale, and Port Orchard/South Kitsap, and these requests have been reviewed in the 10-Year Update along with those submitted in 2006 for the 10-Year Update. The Silverdale Citizens Advisory Committee created a vision, guiding goal and policy formulation, and identified priority growth areas and reviewed draft alternatives over multiple meetings. Hard copies of maps were distributed on request. The Citizens Advisory Group in Port Orchard/South Kitsap developed plan alternatives and policies in a separate process as well. Kingston had a citizens committee as well to help formulate the Phase II Sub-Area Plan.

Letter No. 221 Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning (9/5/06)

Response to Comment 1: KCRP Letter January 6, 2006, Superior Court Orders

The County has appealed the Superior Court decision that is referenced in the comment.

Please see the discussions of reasonable measures considered in the 10-Year Update as identified in the proposed Land Use Element of Volume I, DEIS Section 3.2.3, and DEIS Appendix H as well as FEIS Appendix C.

Response to Comment 2: Table Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan

The Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan has not been separately adopted and is part of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update.

Response to Comment 3: CPSGMHB Kingston Decision

A summary of the Kingston decision is included in the DEIS Chapter 2 and in DEIS Appendix J. The CPSGMHB found that adoption of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan, expanding an individual

UGA prior to the 10-year review of the county’s UGAs, countywide analysis, and collective consideration to accommodate the full 2025 population target did not comply with GMA. The CPSGMHB also found that expansion of the Kingston UGA in advance of adoption of “reasonable measures” did not comply with GMA. In addition, the CPSGMHB indicated that a updated land capacity analysis (ULCA) that discounted un-sewered areas of the existing UGA and a CFP that did not sufficiently provide services did not comply with GMA.

Remand issues have been addressed in the 10-Year Update, as follows:

- The Kingston UGA is considered together with the rest of the 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update.
- Land capacity reductions for distance from sewers have been removed in the capacity analyses for the alternatives
- Reasonable measures are considered in the 10-Year Update as identified in the proposed Land Use Element of Volume I, DEIS Section 3.2.3, and DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C. These include comprehensive plan consolidated categories, establishing minimum densities, density range increases, SEPA threshold increases, alternative sewer technologies, etc.
- DEIS and FEIS Section 3.3 addresses demand for public services over the 20-year planning period. The Capital Facilities Plan identifies specific projects, costs and funding for the GMA-required 6-year period.

Response to Comment 4: KRCC Population Allocations and ULCA Method

The 10-Year Update addresses growth allocations for each UGA.

Land capacity reductions for distance from sewers have been removed in the capacity analyses for the alternatives. Aside from the sewer discount, the CPSGMHB did find in favor of Kitsap County for other discount factors in the ULCA because they were tailored to local circumstances and were balanced by a relatively low market factor.

As described in DEIS Section 3.2.3, the use of the low end of the density range reflects the minimum density the County can require, and it also reflects observed density trends in the *2002 Buildable Lands Report* and more recent permit data collection in 2006. Also, see Response to Comment 3, Letter No. 9, from the Suquamish Tribe.

Response to Comment 5: Change in Density Range

As discussed in DEIS Sections 2.6.4 and 3.2.3, citizen input during the development of alternatives included establishing density levels at 3 du/ac as a blanket average density allowance.

In *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995, the CPSGMHB found that, as a general rule, 4 du/ac or more constitutes urban densities for Kitsap County. A pattern of 1- and 2-1/2-acre lots is a sprawl pattern that should not occur in rural and urban areas.

The alternatives tested in the DEIS apply Urban Low Residential at either 4–9 or 5–9 du/ac, subject to sewer provision or alternative wastewater technology, to provide for urban densities and to allow for cost-effective service delivery.

Alternative 2 includes measures to broaden the residential density range from 5–24 du/ac to 4–30 du/ac overall. Capacity for growth is based on minimum densities of each zone. Therefore, the results of Alternative 2's ULCA reflects the new Urban Low Residential and Urban Cluster Residential minimum density of 4 du/ac instead of 5 du/ac. This reduces the capacity of the single-family designated areas; however, the new minimum of 4 du/ac still meets urban densities as defined in CPSGMHB cases applicable to Kitsap County.

See also Response to Comment 4 regarding the inclusion of reasonable measures.

Response to Comment 6: Need Sewers

The 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update includes new policies to address innovate sewer techniques to allow for sewer service in UGAs. For example see policies LU-14 through 16 in the Land Use Element. Also a regulation is added that requires sewer service for residential development in UGAs.

Response to Comment 7: Consider Average Density in ULCA

Please see Response to Comment 5. Regarding lot size, the County is adding minimum density requirements as part of the development regulations considered in the 10-Year Update.

Response to Comment 8: Density may Differ in Parts of UGAs, Some Areas that are Urban Should be Rural

Density ranges are applied in residential categories to address flexibility to respond to site conditions, neighborhood character, and infrastructure costs.

The County has considered some changes from urban to rural in the Barker Creek Corridor. See Alternative 2 and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 9: Allow 3-9 DU/AC, Capacity of 6 DU/AC and Maximum Lot Size

The proposed Urban Low and Urban Cluster density ranges are 4-9 du/ac, which at the lower end meets the minimum urban density required by the prior GMHB case specific to Kitsap County. The range will allow flexibility to meet neighborhood character, market conditions, and spreading of infrastructure costs based on site-specific conditions.

See Response to Comments 4 and 5 regarding land capacity assumptions for densities and Response to Comment 7 regarding minimum densities.

Letter No. 222 Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning (9/18/06)

Response to Comment 1: Coordination of RWIP and TDR Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. The use of the TDR program in the RWIP is supported in the Preferred Alternative. Any additional density provided in the RWIP may utilize the TDR program to recognize the economic benefit of that additional density without the physical development of those lots. The separation of these programs ensures that the administration, policy application, or alteration of one program would not adversely affect the other program.

Response to Comment 2: Differences between Tribe/KCRP Rural Wooded Proposal and the Draft RWIP.

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. The additional language proposed that would require additional monitoring of Critical Areas prior to release of subsequent acres has been noted. The recommendation of minimum lot size for the RWIP is also noted. Analysis of the program application, in conjunction with the comments from the stakeholder group provided the information that application of this program would be highly dependent upon a site by site physical analysis and review of the most appropriate measures to ensure the maintenance of rural character and critical areas while allowing the maximum flexibility for the development. The comments regarding water provision have been acknowledged, the review and application of new wells does fall under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Ecology and it is anticipated that the state agency would be the lead source of additional regulation regarding these items. The comments regarding the Uses Permitted in the Wooded Reserve and Permanent Open Space tracts are also noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Ownership in the Wooded Reserve and Permanent Open Space tracts does reflect the maximum flexibility with either the original landowner, a Home Owners Association, or third party may hold ownership of these tracts. Please refer to Volume III.

Letter No. 223 Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning (9/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support of TDR Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The TDR program is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. The program was developed in coordination with comments from the diverse positions within the citizen focus groups and stakeholder groups. The provision for restoration of transferred development rights within forty years was provided as a middle ground that allowed two full 20-Year Comprehensive Plan planning cycles and associated updates to occur prior to restoration of any rural development rights and was seen as a necessary

step to keep from constraining rural lands in Kitsap County from unforeseen needs occurring far beyond the 20 year planning cycle of the 10-Year Update.

Response to Comment 2: Requirements for Final Approval

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The TDR program is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time.

Response to Comment 3: Application of the TDR program for future Site Specific Amendments or Rezones.

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The TDR program is part of the Preferred Alternative and upon adoption, would apply to future alterations to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Land Use Map. Please note that the preferred alternative does include an additional provision for future expansions of Urban Growth Areas through either a Comprehensive Plan or Sub-Area Plan may require TDR for those expansions, at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners at time of approval. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 4: TDR - Sending Areas

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that, upon approval as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update. The TDR program would be a program that is applicable for all rural lots including RWIP generated lots to serve as sending areas.

Response to Comment 5: TDR - Receiving Areas

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comment is correct in the assumption that the TDR program would not be applicable until approval as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update. Upon approval, all urban growth areas would be considered as potential receiving sites. Additionally, interlocal agreements with municipal jurisdictions, in conjunction with the UGAMA process would define how each individual municipality may propose to utilize the rural development rights. Please refer to Volume I, Chapter 18 Implementation, Table 18-1 Implementation Strategies, Land Use Goal 10 (Page 18-2).

Response to Comment 6: TDR - Receiving Areas

Please refer to Response to Comment 5.

Response to Comment 7: Procedures for Certification and Approval of TDR

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding a cumbersome certification process are noted. Similar to any real property entitlement process, the Kitsap County Department of Community Development is striving to balance the administration of a complex development rights process and legal entitlement procedure with the necessary requirement for verification, documentation, and tracking of these

entitlements, which may convey significant monetary value. Information brochures and a streamlined process will be applied to the certification process to minimize potential difficulties. In regards to the notice of title time period comment, please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 8: Overall Comments

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comments regarding a cumbersome certification process are noted. Similar to any real property entitlement process, the Kitsap County Department of Community Development is striving to balance the administration of a complex development rights process and legal entitlement procedure with the necessary requirement for verification, documentation, and tracking of these entitlements, which may convey significant monetary value. Information brochures and a streamlined process will be applied to the certification process to minimize potential difficulties. In regards to the 40-year notice of title time period comment, please refer to response to comment 1.

Response to Comment 9: Overall Recommendations

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The TDR program is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. Upon adoption, all rural lands are to be considered as “Sending Areas” and all urban lands are to be considered “Receiving Areas”. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 10: Consideration of Comments

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 224 Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning (10/17/06)

Response to Comment 1: Support of RWIP and TDR Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that Both the RWIP and the TDR program are part of the Preferred Alternative and would be programs that can be course corrected to ensure they meets planning objectives over time.

Response to Comment 2: Coordination of RWIP and TDR Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. The use of the TDR program in the RWIP is supported in the Preferred Alternative. Any additional density provided in the RWIP may utilize the TDR program to recognize the economic benefit of that additional density without the physical development of those lots. The separation of these programs ensures that the administration, policy application, or alternation of one program would not adversely affect the other program.

Response to Comment 3: Coordination of RWIP and TDR Program

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please Refer to Response to Comment 2.

Response to Comment 4: TDR - Receiving Areas

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The comment is correct in the assumption that the TDR program would not be applicable until approval as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update. The TDR program is part of the Preferred Alternative and upon adoption, would apply to future alternations to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Land Use Map. Upon approval, all urban growth areas would be considered as potential receiving sites. Please note that the preferred alternative does include an additional provision for future expansions of Urban Growth Areas through either a Comprehensive Plan or Sub-Area Plan may require TDR for those expansions, at the discretion of the Board of County Commissioners at time of approval. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 5: Economic Impacts of TDR

The comments regarding the economics of Kitsap County rural lands and the associated development rights are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 6: Support of RWIP with Suggestions

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 1.

Response to Comment 7: RWIP Applicability

The comments regarding the timelines for monitoring and evaluation are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that both the RWIP and the TDR program are part of the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 8: RWIP Rural/Urban Split

The comments regarding the monitoring and requirement of a specific benchmark for achievement of the Rural / Urban split are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 9: RWIP Usage

The comments regarding the monitoring and requirement of a specific benchmark for usage of the RWIP are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 10: Roads

The comments and support regarding the monitoring and requirement transportation roadway service failures are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 11: Rural Character

The comments and support regarding future flexibility regarding the monitoring and requirement of rural character are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 12: Critical Areas

The comments and addition regarding the monitoring and requirement of additional benchmarks for protection of Critical Areas, wells, and mitigation measures are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. The additional language proposed that would require additional monitoring of Critical Areas prior to release of subsequent acres has been noted. The comments regarding water provision have also been noted and forwarded. Please note, the review and application of new wells does fall under the jurisdiction of the Washington State Department of Ecology and it is anticipated that the state agency would be the lead source of additional regulation regarding these items.

Response to Comment 13: RWIP Lot Sizes and Buffers

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. The additional language proposed that would require additional monitoring of Critical Areas prior to release of subsequent acres has been noted. The recommendation of minimum lot size for the RWIP is also noted. Analysis of the program application, in conjunction with the comments from the stakeholder group, provided the information that application of this program would be highly dependent upon a site by site physical analysis and review of the most appropriate measures to ensure the maintenance of rural character and critical areas while allowing the maximum flexibility for the development. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 14: RWIP Water Provision

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 12.

Response to Comment 15: RWIP Uses Permitted

The comments regarding the Uses Permitted in the Wooded Reserve and Permanent Open Space tracts and the time periods suggested for the preservation of those tracts are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 16: RWIP Development Standards

The comments regarding the percentage of land available for residential development, including roads and infrastructure are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 17: RWIP Ownership

The comments regarding the Ownership of the Wooded Reserve and Permanent Open Space tracts are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Ownership in the Wooded Reserve and Permanent Open Space tracts does reflect the maximum flexibility with the original landowner, or a Home Owners Association, or third party who may hold ownership of these tracts. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 18: RWIP Vesting

The comments regarding the vesting of developments within the RWIP are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note the RWIP is part of the Preferred Alternative and would be a pilot program that can be course corrected to ensure it meets planning objectives over time. Please refer to Volume III.

Response to Comment 19: RWIP Facilitation & Participation

The comments regarding the facilitation and participation of interested landowners, tribes, and state agency representatives during the initial phase are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 20: RWIP Facilitation & Participation

The comments regarding the facilitation and participation to identify priority conservation areas are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 21: Coordination of RWIP and TDR Program

The comments regarding coordination with the TDR Program are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please refer to Response to Comment 2.

Response to Comment 22: TDR Program Recommendations

The comments regarding recommendation for the TDR Program are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Regarding the comments relating the sending rights please refer to Response to Comment 1. Please note that both the RWIP and the TDR program are part of the Preferred Alternative and would be programs that would participate with interested party citizen advisory groups and stakeholder groups to evaluate their progress and to ensure they meets planning objectives over time.

Response to Comment 23: Consideration of Comments

The comments are noted and have been forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 225 Kitsap Citizens for Responsible Planning (10/23/06)

Response to Comment 1: Prior Correspondence on Racetrack Planning

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 2: Need Full Understanding of IMPRA Before Approving Zoning

Please see Response to Comment 1 under the Richard Danison Letter No. 110 and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 3: Public Opposes NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 4: Transfer Approval to Hearing Examiner

The consideration and potential approval of a development agreement, new zoning, and capital facilities planning, along with a project-level SEPA review are the responsibility of the BOCC as written in the IMPRA and UHA text and are legislative responsibilities subject to full public review. Consideration of a master plan would be heard by the BOCC as a quasi-judicial action.

Response to Comment 5: Transformational Change

Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 6: SEPA Topics

Please see Response to Letter No. 110 Comment 1, Richard Danison and Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton regarding the programmatic level of the 10-Year Update EIS and the requirements for project level SEPA review for projects locating in the IMPRA.

Response to Comment 7: Land Capacity Analysis for SKIA

Please see Response to Letter No. 9 Comment 4, Suquamish Tribe, regarding employment capacity analysis. The Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development was provided all three volumes of the 10-Year Update. The Department's comments indicated that: "Policies LU-105 – LU-108 designating the new IMPRA and 'urban holding area,' are designed to give the county the ability to keep options open for the possibility of a proposed NASCAR facility or other such development. Although the potential for such a significant expansion of new industrial zoned land raises significant Growth Management concerns about provision of urban services and transportation *the county has taken a cautious approach in setting requirements for a master plan, a full EIS and capital facilities planning.*" (emphasis added) Neighboring counties and the Puget Sound Regional Council were distributed copies of the 10-Year Update (see DEIS Fact Sheet and Distribution List). A review of DEIS Alternatives in relation to Countywide Planning Policies related to UGA expansion are provided in DEIS Appendix I. Also, the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council's list of reasonable measures does address the concept of urban holding areas (see DEIS Appendix H/FEIS Appendix C).

Response to Comment 8: Opposed to NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 226 Kitsap Community & Agriculture Alliance

Response to Comment 1: Keep Productive Land in Families and Farms

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Letter No. 13 “Washington State University, Kitsap County Extension, Response to Comment 1: Opinion Survey – Farming and Rural Activities.”

Letter No. 227 Kitsap County Association of Realtors

Response to Comment 1: Withdrawal from IRF/Rural Wooded Stakeholders Group

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for the status of the Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Letter No. 228 Tracyton North Tigers Community Group (William M. Palmer)

Response to Comment 1: Opposition to Reclassification Request at 9582 Tracyton Boulevard NW

The comments in opposition to the proposed reclassification request at 9582 Tracyton Boulevard NW (Warden Request) are noted. The referenced letter from Mr. James A. Province has been included in Chapter 5 of this FEIS as Letter No. 202, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Mr. James A. Province).

Response to Comment 2: Reference to Letter from Mr. James A. Province

Comments regarding the letter from Mr. James A. Province are noted. This letter has been included in Chapter 5 of this FEIS, Letter No. 202, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council (Mr. James A. Province).

Response to Comment 3: Alternatives for the Warden Property

Three alternative land use designations for the Warden Property were considered in the Draft EIS. Alternative 1 (No Action) continued the Urban Low Residential designation, Alternative 2 considered an Urban Low Intensity Commercial Mixed Use land use designation and a Mixed Use (10-30 units/acre) zoning designation, and Alternative 3 considered an Urban High land use designation. The Preferred Alternative designates the site as Urban High Intensity Commercial Mixed Use, implemented by a Mixed Use (10-30 units/acre) zoning designation.

Response to Comment 4: No Precedent for Commercial Zoning in Site Vicinity

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 5: Limit Expansion of Urban High Designation

The comments regarding potential language to limit expansion of the Urban High designation are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 6: Tracyton North Tigers' Position on Warden Property

Your clarification of the TNT neighborhood's position on the Warden Property is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Letter No. 229 Young Democrats of Kitsap County

Response to Comment 1: Oppose SKIA UGA Expansion and NASCAR

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

5.4. Public Hearings

This section responds to comments made at public hearings held September 18, 20, and 21 before the BOCC and the Planning Commission. In addition the BOCC held a hearing on October 23, 2006 that was continued to October 25, 2006. At the time of this writing, draft minutes of the meetings were available. Final minutes had not yet been approved. The draft minutes appear on the compact disk that accompanies this document. A brief summary of the comment topic is contained in the heading above the response to comment. Interested parties are encouraged to contact the Clerk of the Board for final minutes.

5.4.1. September 18, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Illahee Zoning Designations (Jim Aho)

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Also, please see Comment Letter No. 6 (Port of Illahee), responses to comments 1, 2 and 3.

Response to Comment 2: Site Specific Request adjacent to ULID #6 (Bert Esau)

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 114.

Response to Comment 3: Rural Wooded Program (Laura Overton Johanes)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 4: Capital Facilities Program and Affordable Infrastructure (Jerry Porter)

The comment is noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that Volume I, Appendix A contains a Capital Facilities Plan for a 6-year period and the DEIS also addressed public facilities and services for a 20-year period.

Response to Comment 5: Excellent Program Introduction (Ken Killbridge)

The comment is noted.

Response to Comment 6: Question Regarding Potential Effect of Initiative 933 (Jim Sommerhauser)

On September 20, 2006, information about the effect of I-933 was presented to the BOCC in response to the question posed. On November 7, 2006, Initiative 933 failed in the general election and will not take effect.

Response to Comment 7: No Residential Requirement in Mixed Use Designation (Ron Ross)

The intent of the Mixed Use zone is to encourage higher density development to provide additional housing types and maximize infrastructure improvements. The Mixed Use zone provides incentives for housing. Regarding the design districts in the Silverdale downtown, the draft regulations are undergoing additional review in the first part of 2007.

Response to Comment 8: TDR Language; Possible Mapping Error near the Bremerton Airport (Doug Skrobut)

Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 162.

Response to Comment 9: TDR; Land Supply; Reasonable Measures; Capital Facilities (Richard Brown)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 10: Land Use North of Waaga Way (Judith Krigsman)

The comments regarding opposition to a Central Valley extension are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS. Please also see responses to comments by the Concerned Citizens of Central Valley in Section 5.3

Response to Comment 11: Urban Restricted North of Waaga Way (Gail Bickler)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS. Please also see responses to comments by the Concerned Citizens of Central Valley in Section 5.3

Response to Comment 12: Property South of Hwy 16 on Bethel-Burley Road (Ron Wiley)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. As part of the Preferred Alternative, this property has been added to the Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA with an industrial land use designation.

Response to Comment 13: Deadlines for Submitting Comments (Mary Bertrand)

The comment period for the Comprehensive Plan and Integrated Draft EIS extended from August 29 to October 30, 2006. Planning Commission deliberations began between September 21 and October 10, 2006. The BOCC held meetings and deliberations from October 10 to November 6, 2006 and were provided with all comments. The process was discussed at the hearing as indicated in comment 14.

Response to Comment 14: Discussion of Public Comment Deadlines

Comments are noted.

Response to Comment 15: Comments on Several Site Specific Requests (William Palmer)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. See responses to comments in Letter No. 148 above. Please also refer to the description of the Preferred Alternative in Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 16: Consider Site Specific Requests (Pat Waters)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 17: Zoning in Berry Lake Road Area (Ken Mishel)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Comments were received in the Berry Lake area for both inclusion and exclusion from the Urban Growth Area. See also responses to comments in Letters Nos. 144 to 146.

Response to Comment 18: Property North of Waaga Way (Barbara Smithson)

The comments regarding opposition to a Central Valley extension are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS. Please also see responses to comments by the Concerned Citizens of Central Valley in Section 5.3

Response to Comment 19: Availability of Maps (Lori Eckstrom)

During the review of the 10-Year Update, all public review documents were posted on MyKitsap.org. Small versions of maps of the Preferred Alternative are provided in this Final EIS and on the Kitsap County website at MyKitsap.org.

Response to Comment 20: West Bremerton Urban Growth Area (Tom Weaver)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Alternative 2 for West Bremerton was carried forward in the Preferred Alternative. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

5.4.2. September 20, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Delete "Hobby Kennel" Footnote from Zoning Use Table (Art Castle)

The footnote referring to hobby kennels has been removed from the use table in the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 2: Opposed to Alternative 2 Due to Proposed Rezone of Property North of Hwy 303 in Central Valley Area (Nina Morse)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 3: Opposed to Expansion of Urban Growth Area North of Waaga Way (Mary Bertrand)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 4: Proposed Racetrack (Bernard Jacobson)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 5: No Zoning Change for Racetrack (Jacob Metcalf)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 6: Densely Platted Lots Outside of Urban Growth Areas (Jeff Miller)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 7: Rural Wooded Program (John Rose)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in

the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 8: Keep Central Valley Area Rural (Emily Fink)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 9: Waterfront Provision in Rural Wooded Program (Holly Manke White)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. The program will be monitored and the County will work in stakeholders to make changes as needed.

This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 10: Cadwell Request for Mixed Use Zoning (Rick Cadwell)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the subject property as High Density Residential. Please note that that zone does allow for limited non-residential uses including small scale mixed uses and commercial uses.

Response to Comment 11: Opposed to Tax Support for Single Purpose Facility, Such as NASCAR (Trevor Evans)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 12: Address Impacts Outside of Urban Growth Area (Joe Mentor, Jr.)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The EIS (Volume II) considered potential impacts at a cumulative level, including potential impacts to areas outside of urban areas. Please also see responses to comments in Letter No. 85.

Response to Comment 13: Do Not Rezone for NASCAR Without Additional Analysis (Bill Matchett)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 14: Notify Property Owners Before Conducting Field Visits \(Valerie Grahn\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

[Response to Comment 15: Supports Alternative 3 for Port Orchard \(Nick Penovich\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

[Response to Comment 16: Retain Central Valley Road Area as Rural \(Donald Lawrence\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

[Response to Comment 17: Site Specific Request in McCormick Woods ULID #6 UGA \(Ron Cain\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include any expansion to the ULID #6 UGA. Please see responses to comments regarding Letters Nos. 103 and 104.

[Response to Comment 18: Volume 3, Page 3-12 Short Subdivisions \(Kris Danielson\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see Response to Comment 18 in Letter No. 10.

[Response to Comment 19: Urban Low Zoning for Berry Lake Road Area \(Jerry Mischel\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Comments were received in the Berry Lake area for both inclusion and exclusion from the Urban Growth Area. Please also see responses to comments in Letters Nos. 144-146.

[Response to Comment 20: Opposed to Site-Specific Request Adjacent to Illahee Preserve \(Judith Krigsman\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The property is included in the Preferred Alternative as Mixed Use. Please also see responses to comments in letters 72 and 75.

[Response to Comment 21: Opposed to Inclusion in Central Kitsap UGA \(Sue Fink\)](#)

The comments regarding opposition to a Central Valley extension are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS. Please also see responses to comments by the Concerned Citizens of Central Valley in Section 5.3

Response to Comment 22: No Taxpayer's Money for Racetrack; Concerns About Rural Areas (Cliff Brandt)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 23: Support for Alternative 2 for Central and South Kitsap (Ron Perkerewicz)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 24: Site Specific Request for Highway Tourist Commercial (Paul Pazooki)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the referenced properties as Highway Tourist Commercial. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a description of the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 25: Quality Work; Comments on Urban Growth Area Expansions (Tom Donnelly)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 26: Buck and Gordon Regulatory Report (Ron Ross)

Please see Letter No. 52, response to comment No. 1.

Response to Comment 27: Site Specific Request to Remain in Rural Area (Bob Bergum)

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The BOCC approved Alternative 2 for Poulsbo UGA, conditioned on the City of Poulsbo approval. The City of Poulsbo on November 8, 2006 did not agree on Alternative 2 land use changes or UGA boundary expansions, therefore applying Alternative 1 to Poulsbo.

Please note that the Poulsbo UGA population allocation is not met with Alternative 1 (-226), but comes closer with Alternative 2 (-34). The FEIS identifies that further coordination between the City and the County is needed to address the population allocation shortfall with the application of Alternative 1 as part of the Preferred Alternative. Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS Section 3.2.3 for UGAs not meeting targets include population allocation banking or shifting population between UGAs that have greater potential to be densified or expanded to accommodate population, additional reasonable measures to increase densities, or UGA expansions, as appropriate. It is likely that the County and City will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding regarding a process to determine how to resolve the population target, land use, UGA boundaries, etc.

Response to Comment 28: Support for Alternative 1 for Poulsbo (Julie Bergum)

Please see Response to Comment 27 above.

[Response to Comment 29: Support for Alternative 2 for SKIA \(David Overton\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 30: Support for Planning Process; Confusion about Racetrack \(Jim Sommerhauser\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 31: Bring New Economic Development to Kitsap County \(Roger Zabinski\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

[Response to Comment 32: Site Specific Request on Mile Hill Road \(Jim Helm\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does designate your parcel at 4123 Mile Hill Drive as Neighborhood Commercial. The parcel located at 4090 Mile Hill Drive is not designated as commercial and is identified as Urban Low in the Preferred Alternative. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

[Response to Comment 33: Lindstrom Site Specific Request in Central Kitsap UGA \(Richard Shattuck\)](#)

The referenced property is located in the rural area near the Silverdale UGA. Changes to rural area designations (from one rural class to another rural class) were not considered as part of the 10-Year Update. The County will be reviewing rural area policies and designations as part of its 2007 work program.

[Response to Comment 34: Capital Facilities Planning for South Kitsap Industrial Area \(Grant Lynch, Great Western Sports\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

[Response to Comment 35: Planning Process for Racetrack \(Bill Chapman representing Great Western Sports\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 36: Property on Newberry Hill \(Lisetta Lindstrom\)](#)

The referenced property is located in the rural area near the Silverdale UGA. Changes to rural area designations (from one rural class to another rural class) were not considered as part of the 10-Year Update. The County will be reviewing rural area policies and designations as part of its 2007 work program.

Response to Comment 37: Old Clifton Road Property and Support for Alternative 3 (Ruthie Wrothwell)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains Urban Reserve for the property. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 171.

Response to Comment 38: Concerns about NASCAR Proposal (Jacob Metcalf)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 39: Need Open Planning Process for NASCAR Proposal (Tom Donnelly)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 40: Urban Low Residential for Port Orchard Property (Ruthie Wrothwell)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative retains Urban Reserve for the property. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 171.

Response to Comment 41: Site Specific Request #31 -- Lindstrom Property (Richard Shattuck)

The referenced property is located in the rural area near the Silverdale UGA. Changes to rural area designations (from one rural class to another rural class) were not considered as part of the 10-Year Update. The County will be reviewing rural area policies and designations as part of its 2007 work program.

Response to Comment 42: Difference Between Category III and Category IV Decisions (Jim Sommerhauser)

As described in Comment 43 of the September 20 Kitsap County Commissioners Minutes, all decisions regarding the development agreement master plan would be decisions by the Board of County Commissioners.

Response to Comment 43: Hearing Process for NASCAR Track Proposal (Staff)

As described in Comment 43, each component of the master plan for the proposed NASCAR track would require a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners and approval by the Board would be required before any action.

Response to Comment 44: Board of Commissioners Decision Guidelines (Staff)

Please see text of Comment 44 of the September 20 Kitsap County Commissioners Minutes.

Response to Comment 45: Support for Alternative 2 for Central and South Kitsap (Ron Perkerewicz)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 46: Concerns about the Rural Wooded Program and TDR Program (Tom Donnelly)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a description of the RWIP and TDR Program in the Preferred Alternative. Please also see responses to comments in Letter No. 224.

Response to Comment 47: Concerns about the TDR Program (Ron Ross)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a description of the TDR Program in the Preferred Alternative. Please also see responses to Letter No. 51.

5.4.3. September 21, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Support for NASCAR in Kitsap County (Mike Rasmussen)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 2: Does not Support Development on Central Valley Road (Alyssa Fink)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 3: Does Not Support Expansion of the UGA North of Waaga Way (Scott Fink)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Response to Comment 4: Survey Results on Rural Resource Lands and Development Chapters (Arno Bergstrom, Washington State University Extension)

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 13.

Response to Comment 5: Site Specific Comments for Properties on Glenwood Road and Sedgewick Road (Terry Cousins)

The comments regarding these parcels are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The parcel located at 6200 Glenwood Road SW is proposed within the Urban Growth

Area as Highway with a Highway Tourist Commercial designation. are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The parcel located at 855 Sedgwick Road, the parcel is proposed within the Urban Growth Area as Highway Tourist Commercial. Please refer to the Preferred Alternative map in FEIS Chapter 2, the Final Plan maps in Volume I Chapter 2, and zoning maps in Volume III.

Response to Comment 6: Mini Storage in High Density Residential in Kingston (J.R. Sherrard)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Uses lawfully established in accord with regulations at the time are considered grandfathered.

Response to Comment 7: Endorsement of the Racetrack (Virgin Hamilton)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 8: Remove Hobby Kennel Footnote from Development Regulations (Janis Castle)

The footnote referring to hobby kennels has been removed from the use table in the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 9: Expand Port Orchard UGA South Along SR 16 to Mullenix Road (Ron Templeton)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not include the referenced parcel in the Port Orchard UGA. The area has an industrial designation, which does allow business park use.

Response to Comment 10: Appreciation for Commissioner Lent (Eugene Brennan)

Your comment is noted.

Response to Comment 11: Support for Alternative 2 along Woods Road (Carolyn Back)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please note that the Preferred Alternative does not include urban commercial designations along Mile Hill Drive at Woods Road. The present classifications in Alternative 1 would apply.

Response to Comment 12: Supports Alternative 2 in the SKIA UGA (Grant Griffen, Visitor & Convention Bureau)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 13: Opposition to Site Specific Request at 9506 Mickleberry Road NW (Peter Spitzer, Dyes Inlet Preservation Council)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative designates this property as Urban High Density Residential. Please see responses to comments in letters 199 and 200.

Response to Comment 14: Supports Alternative 2 and SKIA (Richard Davis)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 15: Do Not Make Accommodations for NASCAR/ISC Proposal (Mel Armstrong)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 16: Changes to Port of Bremerton SEPA Lead Agency Authority (Ken Attebery, Port of Bremerton)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see responses to Letters Nos. 2 through 5 above.

Response to Comment 17: Does Not Support Rural Wooded Incentive Plan as Proposed (Rod Reid, Alpine Evergreen)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 18: Rezone Property in Gorst to Highway Commercial (Richard Brown)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 19: Site Specific Request for Inclusion in Gorst UGA (Gary Anderson for Lockhart Reclassification Request)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the referenced property in the Gorst UGA.

Response to Comment 20: Rolling Hills Golf Course Zoning Status (Jim Aho)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does include the Rolling Hills Golf Course as Urban Reserve (1 du/ 10 acres). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the

review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Response to Comment 21: Property on Central Valley Road (Nadean Ross)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS. Please also see responses to comments in Letters Nos. 48 and 54.

Response to Comment 22: Urban Commercial and Mixed Use Regulations are Poor (Ron Ross)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-maker. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS and Volume III for a description of the Urban Commercial and Mixed Use regulations under the Preferred Alternative. Please also see responses to comments in letter 50.

Response to Comment 23: Restoration of Johnson Creek and Support for Alternative 1 in Poulsbo (Molly Lee)

The comments are noted and forwarded to appropriate decision-makers. The BOCC approved Alternative 2 for Poulsbo UGA, conditioned on the City of Poulsbo approval. The City of Poulsbo on November 8, 2006 did not agree on Alternative 2 land use changes or UGA boundary expansions, therefore applying Alternative 1 to Poulsbo. Please see the Preferred Alternative land use map in Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

Please note that the Poulsbo UGA population allocation is not met with Alternative 1 (-226), but comes closer with Alternative 2 (-34). The FEIS identifies that further coordination between the City and the County is needed to address the population allocation shortfall with the application of Alternative 1 as part of the Preferred Alternative. Mitigation measures identified in the DEIS Section 3.2.3 for UGAs not meeting targets include population allocation banking or shifting population between UGAs that have greater potential to be densified or expanded to accommodate population, additional reasonable measures to increase densities, or UGA expansions, as appropriate. It is likely that the County and City will enter into a Memorandum of Understanding regarding a process to determine how to resolve the population target, land use, UGA boundaries, etc.

Response to Comment 24: Supports Alternative 1 for Poulsbo; No Change to UGA (John Lee)

Please see Response to Comment 23.

Response to Comment 25: Opposed to Alternative 3 Changes for Anderson Hill/Berry Lake Road Area; NASCAR Tourism Not Needed (Mike McCuddin)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final

Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Comments were received in the Berry Lake area for both inclusion and exclusion from the Urban Growth Area.

Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 26: Support for Greater Environmental Protection \(Dan Hagen, Friends of Wilson Creek\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see DEIS Section 3.1 regarding an analysis of impacts to the natural environment.

[Response to Comment 27: Do Not Expand UGA North of Highway 303 \(Barn Smithson\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS.

[Response to Comment 28: Re-designate Urban Reserve as Rural Residential \(Jerry Harless\)](#)

Please see the response to comment 17, Letter No. 10 and responses to comments in Letter No. 129.

[Response to Comment 29: Designation of Manchester as Rural Village \(Debby Trudeau\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please also see responses to comments in Letter No. 166.

[Response to Comment 30: Better Coordination Between County and Health Department \(Judith Krigsman\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

[Response to Comment 31: Retain Current Highway Tourist Commercial Designation for Property on Highway 303 \(Jean Munie\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the properties as Highway Tourist Commercial. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 86.

[Response to Comment 32: Support for Alternative 2 for Central Kitsap \(Jeff Coombe\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

5.4.4. October 23 and October 25, 2006

Response to Comment 1: Changes to Designations in Illahee and Petition Submitted (Jim Aho)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does change the Sunset and East Boulevard zoning from Urban Low, as presented in Alternative 2, to Urban Restricted residential (1-5 du/acre).

Response to Comment 2: Comments on IMPRA, Rural Wooded Program, Urban Density and Boundary (Tom Nevins)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Regarding the IMPRA, please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Citizen groups have lobbied for residential densities lower than 5 dwelling units per acre to maintain neighborhood character – as low as 3 dwelling units per acre. In *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995, the CPSGMHB found that, as a general rule, 4 dwelling units per acre or more constitutes urban densities for Kitsap County. Four dwelling units per acre addresses GMA requirements specific to Kitsap County and these community desires.

Response to Comment 3: Prepare EIS on NASCAR Proposal (Sandra Bullock)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 4: Delete Zoning Changes for Racetrack from SKIA (Wade Lundstrom)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 5: Wrong to Change Zoning for Racetrack (Ray McGovern)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 6: Comment on Volume III, Errata 19 (Gary Lindsey)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternatives deletes the reference to buffers in the note.

Response to Comment 7: Reconsider Rezoning for NASCAR (Gene Bullock)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 8: Support for Alternative 1 (Molly Lee)

Please see response to comment 23 in minutes dated September 21, 2006.

Response to Comment 9: Do Not Include Royal Valley in UGA (Mary Bertrand)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS. Please also see responses to comments in Letter No. 195.

Regarding the SKIA UGA, please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 10: Include Berry Lake, Old Clifton Road Area in UGA (Jerry Mishel)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. For additional information regarding the analysis of the Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area, please refer to the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Preliminary Sub-Area Plan/ Preliminary Final Environmental Impact Statement dated May 2006. Comments were received in the Berry Lake area for both inclusion and exclusion from the Urban Growth Area. Please also see responses to comments in letters 144-146.

Response to Comment 11: Do Not Change Zoning at 9582 Tracyton Road SE (John Taylor)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. As described in this FEIS, the Preferred Alternative would rezone this property to Mixed Use, with a residential density of 10 to 30 units/acre. Please also see responses to comments in Letter No. 228.

Response to Comment 12: Comments on NASCAR, UGA Size and Density, Rural Wooded Program (Tom Donnelly)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Regarding NASCAR, please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Citizen groups have lobbied for residential densities lower than 5 dwelling units per acre to maintain neighborhood character – as low as 3 dwelling units per acre. In *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995, the CPSGMHB found that, as a general rule, 4 dwelling units per acre or more constitutes urban densities for Kitsap County. Four dwelling units per acre addresses GMA requirements specific to Kitsap County and these community desires.

The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with

Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Please also see responses to comments in Letters Nos. 221 to 225.

Response to Comment 13: Support for RWIP (Phil Struck)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 14: Opposed to NASCAR Proposal (Ron Vanderworth)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 15: Rural Corridor Between Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGAs (Michael McKinley)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a description of the rural area around the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs.

Response to Comment 16: No Highway Tourist Commercial or Mixed Use Designations at Kitsap Transit Park and Ride (Judith Krigsman)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The property is included in the Preferred Alternative as Mixed Use. Please see responses to comments in Letters Nos. 72 and 75.

Response to Comment 17: Require EIS for NASCAR Proposal (Bill Cushman)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 18: Mixed Use Designation for Site on Mickelberry Road; Consider NASCAR Environmental and Cost Information (Rick Cadwell)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative designates the referenced property for Urban High Density Residential. Please also see responses to comments in letters 65 and 66.

Regarding NASCAR, please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 19: Exclude 40 acres from UGA and Upzone Mile Hill Commercial (Monty Mahan)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. As requested, the Port Orchard UGA was reduced in the Preferred Alternative near Baby Doll Road. However, the referenced area on Mile Hill was not upzoned; but reverted to rural commercial.

Response to Comment 20: Include Barker Creek Corridor in UGA (Ron Ross)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS, as well as responses to comments in Letter No. 54.

Response to Comment 21: Support Volume III for Non-conforming Lots (Mike Wilson)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative addresses lot aggregation in Manchester.

Response to Comment 22: Include Barker Creek Corridor in UGA (Robert Ross)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative does not extend the urban area north of Waaga Way. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS, as well as responses to comments in Letter No. 54.

Response to Comment 23: Support Alternative 2 (Tom Wells)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 24: Support for Alternative 2 (Fred Deepe)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers.

Response to Comment 25: Habitat Value of 46 acres on Baby Doll Road (Delilah Rene)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Under the Preferred Alternatives, this property has been retained as rural. Please see responses to comments in Letters Nos. 141 and 142.

Response to Comment 26: Rene Property Not Appropriate for Urban Development (Michelle McFadden)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Under the Preferred Alternatives, this property has been retained as rural. Please see responses to comments in Letters Nos. 141 and 142.

Response to Comment 27: Support Alternative 2 for SKIA (Stacy Tucker)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 28: Support Alternative 2 for SKIA \(Dee Capolla\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 29: Support Alternative 2 for SKIA \(Denise Lietz\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 30: Comments on Urban Restricted, Minimum Lot Size, Mixed Use, Economic Development Policies, and Shoreline Buffers \(Teresa Osinski\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 205.

[Response to Comment 31: RWIP \(John Rose\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 47.

[Response to Comment 32: Comments on Regulatory Changes and Rural Wooded Program \(Art Castle\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 205.

The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

[Response to Comment 33: Does Not Support Racetrack Proposal \(Mary Coburn\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 34: Supports Racetrack Proposal \(Roger Nance\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 35: Comments on Time to Review, UGA Size, Unsewered Densities \(Mike Gustavson\)](#)

Please responses to comments, Letters Nos. 124 and 125.

Response to Comment 36: RWIP (Holly Manke White)

The RWIP is intended to recognize and preserve forestry as the primary land use while allowing for innovative residential uses such as rural clustered housing. It is intended as a pilot program for 5,000 of the 50,000 rural wooded acres to ensure that the program meets its intended goals or is amended as appropriate before additional lands are included. This program was studied with Alternative 3 in the DEIS. Please see Chapter 2 of this FEIS for a discussion of Rural Wooded policies and regulations and the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 37: Collaborative Planning, Support Central Kitsap Mixed Use (Geoff Wentland, City of Bremerton)

Please see comments and responses to Letter No. 1, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 38: More Consideration of Rural Areas; Additional Review of Regulations Needed (Bill Palmer)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Additional consideration of rural areas and additional urban and rural regulations are part of the County's 2007 work program.

Response to Comment 39: Support Alternative 2 for SKIA (Sylvia Klatman)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

Response to Comment 40: Supports Commercial Zoning to Wood Road (Carolyn Bach)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Property along Mile Hill Road is not included in the UGA under the Preferred Alternative.

Response to Comment 41: Do Not Deduct Buffers from Density in Urban Restricted; Protect Johnson Creek (John Johnson)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Regarding buffers in Urban Restricted, please see the responses to comments in Letter No. 81.

Response to Comment 42: Rolling Hills Golf Course; Silverdale Estates Mobile Home Park (Irwin Krigsman)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative for the Central Kitsap UGA does include the Rolling Hills Golf Course as Urban Reserve (1 du/10 acres). It is also expected that future zoning of these properties, as well as the review of the Central Kitsap UGA will take place as part of the UGAMA with the City of Bremerton, County and interested parties in 2007/2008. Please see Volume I; Chapter 2: Land Use, policies LU-26, -27, and -29.

Housing policies in the Housing and Silverdale Chapters of the Preferred Alternative Comprehensive Plan support the provision of housing options affordable a range of incomes.

[Response to Comment 43: Site Specific Addition to Urban Low in Kingston \(Bill Palmer\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternatives does not include the referenced property in the Kingston UGA. The Kingston UGA boundaries are consistent with the boundaries recommended by the citizens advisory committee and established by the BOCC in December 2005.

[Response to Comment 44: Urban Low Designation at Rocky Point \(Derrek Jaros\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative includes the referenced property in the UGA in the West Bremerton UGA. Please see responses to comments in Letter No. 87.

[Response to Comment 45: Supports Alternative 2 for SKIA \(Virgil Hamilton\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 46: Site Specific Request for Urban Low in Silverdale; Urban Restricted Density \(Mark Kuhlman\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. The Preferred Alternative would retain the Industrial designation on this property. Please see responses to comments in letter 78.

[Response to Comment 47: No Placeholder for NASCAR \(Jim Sommerhauser\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

[Response to Comment 48: Supports Process Established for IMPRA \(David Overton\)](#)

The comments are noted and forwarded to the appropriate decision-makers. Please see Response to Letter No. 1 Comment 14, City of Bremerton.

TOC

Chapter 5. Comments and Responses 5-1

- 5.1. Government Agencies, Tribes, Special Districts, and Utilities 5-2
- 5.2. Citizens, Businesses and Property Owners5-28
 - 5.2.1. North Kitsap5-28
 - 5.2.2. Central Kitsap.....5-46
 - 5.2.3. South Kitsap.....5-58
 - 5.2.4. Unspecified5-100
- 5.3. Interest Groups5-104
- 5.4. Public Hearings.....5-153
 - 5.4.1. September 18, 2006.....5-153
 - 5.4.2. September 20, 2006.....5-156
 - 5.4.3. September 21, 2006.....5-162
 - 5.4.4. October 23 and October 25, 2006.....5-167

Tables

- Table 5.1-1. Agency Letters 5-2
- Table 5.2-1. North Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters.....5-28
- Table 5.2-2. Central Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters5-46
- Table 5.2-3. South Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters5-58
- Table 5.2-4. Kitsap Citizen, Business and Property Owner Comment Letters: Unspecified Locations ...5-100
- Table 5.3-1. Interest Group Comment Letters: Unspecified Locations5-105

Figures

Error! No table of figures entries found.

ACROS

- Water Resources Inventory Area [WRIA.....5-132

Citations

- Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies 2004.....5-135

Appendices

Error! No table of figures entries found.