

DEIS Public Comment Response Matrix

#	Author Name	Comment, Letter, or Letter Title	Response	Source	Applicable EIS Section
520	WDFW	<p>Alternative 1, “No Action”</p> <p>Alternative 1 does not offer any extra environmental safeguards beyond the present levels. These protective measures currently fall short of WDFW's management recommendations that are based on the best available scientific evidence and the goals of GMA during this periodic update. Due to these factors, WDFW requests that the county not pursue Alternative 1.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments on Alternative 1 will be forwarded to County decision makers.	Letter	2.5
521	WDFW	<p>Alternative 2, “Compact Growth/Urban Center Focus”</p> <p>WDFW prefers the objectives outlined in Alternative 2 out of the three proposed alternatives but acknowledges that even this alternative falls short of fully meeting the agency's recommendations. The compact growth focus of this alternative promotes infill, limits urban growth area (UGA) expansions to 464 acres, and affects the least amount of non-fish bearing streams out of the three alternatives. WDFW also recognizes that this alternative would enable Kitsap County to achieve the 2044 housing goals while falling just short of the expected employment rate provided by the Department of Commerce but reaches towards VISION 2050 targets closer than the other alternatives. WDFW highlights that this alternative focuses on the urban growth in areas of Silverdale and Kingston while limiting the UGA expansion of Bremerton, Port Orchard, and Poulsbo. The tree replacement rates for urban residential areas are reasonable to reestablish green spaces and shade as those trees mature. Even with the notable aspects above, we have concerns with this alternative due to the expected impact on 1,477 linear feet of non-fish bearing streams, no expansion of stream buffer widths, and the increase in fragmented habitat.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments on Alternative 2 will be forwarded to County decision makers.	Letter	2.5
522	WDFW	<p>Alternative 3, “Dispersed Growth Focus”</p> <p>Alternative 3 is the only option that proposes expanding the riparian buffer widths from 50 feet to 100 feet for non-fish bearing streams and imposing tree retention requirements for development. Although these steps are closer to WDFW management recommendations than the other alternatives in this DEIS, the expected expansion of UGAs by 1,049 acres and impacts to non-fish bearing streams by 17,936 feet is a significant concern. Therefore, we do not recommend that Kitsap County pursue this alternative.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments on Alternative 3 will be forwarded to County decision makers.	Letter	2.5
523	WDFW	<p>WDFW Recommendations:</p> <p>WDFW is recommending Kitsap County explore a hybrid alternative between Alternatives 2 and 3. This would help increase environmental protections as stated in these options while fulfilling the overarching GMA goals outlined during this update process. This suggested hybrid alternative would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All features of Alternative 2 including but not limited to focused infill, limited UGA expansions, limited impacts to non-fish bearing streams, and tree replacement rates • Features from Alternative 3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Adding an increased stream buffer width from 50 feet to 100 feet (minimum) for non-fish bearing streams o Tree retention rates for urban areas <p>These increased environmental protections may still fall short of WDFW's full management recommendations, but it would be an overall increased benefit from the current protections in place.</p>	Thank you for your feedback. Your comments on a blend of alternatives will be forwarded to County decision makers.	Letter	2.5
524	WDFW	<p>Our agency requests that Kitsap consider using low-impact development and green infrastructure during infill development to promote better air and water quality, stormwater management, climate adaptation measures, and limited impervious surfaces during development. Although not required until 2029 for Kitsap County, WDFW supports early adoption of the climate change goals and action plans outlined by the Department of Commerce.</p>	Your comment on the Climate Element is noted. County decision makers will consider adding LID and green infrastructure requirements to the preferred alternative.	Letter	Multiple
525	WDFW	<p>WDFW's management recommendation for full riparian function can be achieved using the Site Potential Tree Height at age 200 (SPTH200). We urge Kitsap County to consider adopting this method for delineating riparian management zones to prevent any further loss of functions and values in these ecologically important and vulnerable priority habitats. This approach can also help to increase water and air quality, which were noted as concerns across all alternatives outlined in the Kitsap DEIS along with promoting habitat connectivity corridors and open spaces.</p>	The contents of the DEIS are conservative with regard to protection of critical areas. Changes to the CAO, which are still under development, are likely to be more protective of environmental resources and reduce impacts.	Letter	Multiple
526	WDFW	<p>WDFW underscores that counties and cities shall include the best available science in developing policies and development regulations (RCW 36.70A.172). Our riparian resources, including but not limited to the Riparian Ecosystems, Volume 1: Science Synthesis and Management Implications, Volume 2: Management Recommendations, and the SPTH200 GIS mapping tool, are based on current best available science. We encourage Kitsap County to follow these recommendations more closely as the county continues to develop and revise its DEIS alternatives, Comprehensive Plan, and Critical Areas Ordinance. When departures from the best available science are made in policies and development regulations, scientifically based, reasoned justifications must be provided in the record (WAC 365-195-915(1)(c)). Adaptive management programs, such as the Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program, should be followed when departures from the best available science occur as outlined in WAC 365-195-920 (1)(b).</p>	As noted above, the contents of the DEIS are conservative with regard to protection of critical areas. Changes to the CAO, which are still under development, will address Best Available Science and are likely to be more protective of environmental resources and reduce impacts than current code.	Letter	Multiple