



Introduction to the Planning Commission Public Comment Response Matrix

This Comment Response Matrix includes public comments received during the Kitsap County Planning Commission comment period of September 15, 2002 – October 17, 2022. The comments are organized by commenter, summary of comments received, and Department response. Column one is the number of the comment. Column two indicates the name and organization, if applicable, of the commenter. The Summary of Comment column includes a summary of each public comment. The Department Response column indicates whether a change to the proposed code amendment is recommended and associated rationale. The full written comment letters were transmitted to the Planning Commission in advance of the October 18, 2022 meeting.

Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS				
Ref #	Name (Org)	Type	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
1	David Kutz	Comment Form	Lack of safe bike lanes and wide enough shoulders, particularly in North Kitsap	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Bike lanes are outside of the scope of this code update project.
2	Erin Taylor	Comment Form	Would like to see a Tesla Supercharger for public use in walking distance of local Bremerton businesses	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. This code update only specifies charging level requirements and is silent on brands or charging networks. Additionally, this code update is not applicable inside Bremerton's city limits.
3	Martin Choy	Comment Form	Suggests specific brands of chargers/charging networks for specific locations.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Please see comment response #2.
4	MCAC	Dropped Off	No summary, please see compiled comment document for full set of questions.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Questions are outside the limited scope of this code update and are more appropriate at the state and/or vehicle manufacturer level.
5	Jim Barnes	Comment Form	Prefer to see only incentives used for charging stations, should require 30 amp 220 volt electric service near residential parking areas. Public charging isn't practical. High capacity charging sites near Highway 3 would meet demand.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. The requirements for electric vehicle charging are largely based on the requirements in WAC 51-50-0429 and as provided RCW 19.27.040, local jurisdictions may amend but may not reduce the minimum performance standards in the state building code. The required electrical service as outlined in WAC 51-50-0429 is minimum 40 amp, 208/240 volt. Demand will continue to increase as adoption rates of electric vehicles increase, which is why the code applies throughout the county and not only in high traffic areas.

6	Laurie Sterling	Comment Form	Challenge is about safe bicycle riding, not as much about bicycle parking, especially in South Kitsap. Lack of dedicated bike lanes and narrow roads.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Please see comment response #1.
7	Jim Barnes	Email	Costs will be passed along to consumers; the changes miss the mark of the needs of the EV community. Incentives instead of mandates for businesses, most people will charge at home. No Tesla Supercharger in the County. Amend the residential building code to require service in residential parking areas.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Please see comment responses #2, #5. The proposed code, in accordance with the requirements of WAC 51-50-0429, does require the minimum service to be available in new residential construction, but a charger is not required to be installed.
8	Venus Pettersen	Comment Form	Want to buy an EV, worried about lack of charging facilities. Want them in prime locations.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. The only control the County has over where chargers will be installed is for new construction and substantial redevelopment. DCD staff suggests letting existing locations know you would like to have the option to charge at their sites.
9	Anthony Hitchman	Comment Form	Bike code ok, EV not. Government is picking winners and losers by requiring electric when hydrogen vehicles could be on the horizon.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. The EV requirements are coming from a revision to the State Building Code, in WAC 51-50-0429.
10	Elizaabeth Roberts	Comment Form	Thankful for the code amendments. Cycles for errands and has to preplan where to go based on bike parking.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.
11	Sean McGowan	Email	Wants to see Kitsap be more bicycle friendly, not enough bike lanes and not enough secure bicycle parking. Want more Level 3 chargers in Kitsap and more enforcement in existing EV charging locations.	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Please see comment response #1. Additionally, the proposed code requires signage such that EV charging spaces are reserved not only for EVs, but specifically for EVs while they are charging.
12	Jess Chandler	Comment Form	Suggests a fee in lieu for bicycle parking with fee going to County to provide bike parking in right of way. Too much vehicle parking still required and incentives don't seem big enough. Secure long-term bike parking not considered in the code except as incentives. How to get bike parking where it's needed in places redevelopment is unlikely?	Thank you for your comments, no change recommended. Bicycle facilities in the right of way are outside the scope of this code project, and the location closest to the main entrance of the structure was chosen because of the number of security concerns that were raised in the public survey for the project. The reductions for each type of incentive are stackable up to 25% total. DCD staff in their initial review and discussions of draft code felt that 10% for any one incentive type was too much, and that numbers in between 5 and 10% became awkward to calculate. Requiring secure and/or covered bicycle parking as part of this code update felt like it would be too much of a deviation. In many ways, the bicycle parking portion of this code update was an expansion or clarification of existing code, which previously had very little guidance for bicycle parking. Incentives for these are a good way to encourage developers to consider them in their design process.

				As for getting bicycle parking facilities at existing locations which are unlikely to redevelop, there's no good mechanism from a permitting standpoint to require this and would likely be considered overreach. Staff suggests speaking with owners/managers at the locations you're thinking of to make this request.
13	Caroline Raganit	Comment Form	More EV infrastructure in new developments, places with high turnover. Encourage employers to install chargers. Work with private sector for more chargers, and chargers with solar panels.	<p>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</p> <p>At this time we don't expect to require more EV charging infrastructure than what is proposed in the current draft. We do include incentives that may increase the amount on a given project site. As with bicycle parking in locations that are unlikely to redevelop, staff suggests speaking with owners/managers to request the installation of chargers. The draft code very specifically does not state who must own or operate the charging equipment, which leaves the possibility for developers/site owners to collaborate with private sector charging networks rather than installing and operating the charging equipment themselves.</p>
14	Brian Watson (Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facilities Committee)	Verbal Testimony	Code provides clarity, allows people to use bikes for everyday transportation needs. Encourages approval.	<p>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</p> <p>Thank you for helping begin this project.</p>
15	William Palmer (KAPO)	Verbal Testimony	Three codes, including parking code, combined into one project and it's confusing. SEPA DNS is wrong, no non-project addendum and doesn't account for energy use from power grid. EV code could be done with incentives only. Ordinance doesn't reference state code. Will increase housing costs. Adding regulation for regulation's sake. Bike code should also be incentive based, is supposed to be applicable in high transit areas only.	<p>Thank you for your comments, one change recommended.</p> <p>There are only changes to the main section of the parking code that are specifically related to the bicycle and electric vehicle updates. Because changes to county code must be made on the section level, all of 17.490.020 is included in Section 7 of the ordinance in order to make the change removing via strikeout the existing bicycle parking requirements in subsection H.10. (page 8, lines 20-22). All of section 17.490.030 is included in Section 8 for the same reason, the only change is to add via underline a section about the reduction in required vehicle parking by using incentives for bike and EV provisions in subsection A.3. (page 13, lines 27-29). Underlines are not required in ordinances when an entirely new section is added, as in Sections 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10.</p> <p>The SEPA checklist does include the non-project addendum, it begins on pdf page 15. While the checklist does not specifically mention Kitsap's local power grid, PSE is already working towards upgrading their capabilities knowing that transportation electrification is on the rise and the statements about overall energy impacts are accurate.</p> <p>The staff report does mention the state codes requiring the electric vehicle charging infrastructure, but the ordinance does not. Suggested amendment to ordinance Section 3 below.</p>

				<p><u>3. The proposed code amendments for electric vehicle infrastructure were developed in response to, and are compliant with, the requirements in RCW 19.27.540 and WAC 51-50-0429.</u></p> <p>While this code amendment may increase the cost of multi-family housing somewhat, the County cannot choose not to adopt required state building code amendments. Neither the bicycle code, which is an expansion and clarification of existing regulation, or the electric vehicle code, which is required by the state and is also a wise choice from a climate change perspective, are regulations simply for the sake of regulation. The previous requirements for bicycle parking were not incentive based, and were insufficient, so an incentive basis does not work for this need. The scope of the bicycle code was not about high transit areas, but about urban vs rural uses, largely.</p>
--	--	--	--	---