

Chapter 5. Clarifications and Corrections

This Chapter includes clarifications and corrections to the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Draft SEIS). Each chapter is addressed in order of the Draft SEIS. The changes are made in response to comments or by consultant or agency staff review. The clarifications or corrections do not alter fundamental conclusions of the Draft SEIS.

5.1. Draft SEIS Chapter 1 Summary

The following changes are proposed in response to public comments in Chapter 6. The text is intended to distinguish the growth level assumptions studied countywide, whereas the Unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UGA) growth is expressed in terms of capacity since the County is responsible for sizing those areas.

1.6.3.2. Relationship to Plans and Policies

What impacts did we identify?

~~With the exception of Alternative 1, which does not provide sufficient land capacity for projected urban growth,~~ The alternatives are generally consistent with adopted plans and policies, though some alternatives are more aligned with the goals of particular plans and laws than others.

What does it mean? What is different between the alternatives?

Alternative 1 would maintain UGA sizes, with some below targets and some above.

Alternative 2 is most closely aligned with the goals of GMA because it appropriately sizes UGAs and fosters a more compact development pattern to reduce sprawl.

Alternatives 2 and 3 most closely balance UGA land supply with adopted growth targets and include plan amendments that are necessary under GMA requirements.

Alternatives 2 and 3 include adjustments to UGA boundaries to remove areas where provision of urban services would be problematic. This is in alignment with the goals of GMA, which require adequate provision of public services in urban areas.

5.2. Draft SEIS Chapter 2 Alternatives

The following editorial change is made in Chapter 2:

2.6.15. ~~Source: Kitsap County DCD 2015~~ Comprehensive Plan Element Amendments

The following correction is made to Exhibit 2.6-30, Alternative 3 All Inclusive Features, and Description, within the row describing rural land use plan and zoning changes. Though a LAMIRD designation was not proposed at Keyport Junction under Alternative 3, all reclassification requests in that location were studied.

Exhibit 2.6-30 Alternative 3 All Inclusive Features and Description

Features	Description
Land Use Plan and Zoning Changes by Location	Rural: Added Type III LAMIRD designation at Keyport Junction and at Port Orchard Airport. Addition of Type I LAMIRD per reclassification request. Changes from Urban Reserve to Rural Residential, Rural Protection, and Industrial with Mineral Resource Overlay. See also reclassification requests.

Note: Includes parcel acres and streets; excludes water acres.

Source: Kitsap County 2014

5.3. Draft SEIS Chapter 3. Affected Environment, Significant Impacts, and Mitigation Measures

5.3.1. Draft SEIS Section 3.1 Natural Environment

5.3.1.1. Draft SEIS 3.2.1 Earth

No changes.

5.3.1.2. Draft SEIS 3.1.2 Air Quality

No changes.

5.3.1.3. Draft SEIS 3.1.3 Water Resources (Surface and Ground)

No changes.

5.3.1.4. Draft SEIS 3.1.4 Plants and Animals

The following change is made in responses to comments described in Chapter 6.

Regulations and Commitments

- Kitsap County supports and implements ecological restoration projects. Planned restoration projects are highlighted in the Shoreline Restoration Plan, Appendix C of the adopted Kitsap County SMP, Chico Watershed Plan, and salmon recovery plans. Kitsap County is also an active member jurisdiction in leading the Hood Canal Coordinating

Council and the West Sound Watersheds Council, both of which are responsible for coordinating the implementation of restoration actions within the Kitsap Peninsula and Hood Canal regions.

5.3.2. Draft SEIS 3.2. Built Environment: Land Use and Transportation

5.3.2.1. Draft SEIS Land and Shoreline Use

The following changes are proposed in response to public comments in Chapter 6. The text is intended to distinguish the growth level assumptions studied countywide, whereas the Unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UGA) growth is expressed in terms of capacity since the County is responsible for sizing those areas.

Impacts of Alternative 1

Conversion of Uses

Under Alternative 1, the urban areas of the county would be more compact than Alternative 3, but less compact than Alternative 2. However, as noted in Chapter 2, the current UGA boundaries collectively do not provide sufficient capacity to meet adopted growth targets for these areas. As a result, spillover development may occur in rural areas adjacent to UGAs in response to growth pressures. This spillover growth would likely be of a lower intensity and more dispersed than growth in urban areas, increasing sprawl.

Changes in Activity Level

Potential impacts from growth and changes in activity levels would be similar to what is described under Impacts Common to All Alternatives. However, as Alternative 1 does not provide sufficient ~~urban-UGA~~ capacity for projected 2036 population growth levels, a greater portion of increased residential activity may be located in rural areas as spillover development occurs outside UGAs. Alternative 1 has more than sufficient UGA employment capacity and such land may be used less efficiently than if the capacity and growth targets were in greater alignment.

Impacts of Alternative 2

Conversion of Uses

Under Alternative 2, conversion of uses would occur primarily in areas of UGA expansion and in urban locations where zoning would be changed to allow increased density and development intensity. In particular, conversion of uses is most likely to occur in the Silverdale area as Urban Low Residential areas are rezoned for Urban High Residential and as additional land is added to the UGA for industrial zoning. In the Bremerton West UGA, some conversion is likely where the UGA is expanded to allow urban residential uses north and southwest of Kitsap Lake.

~~Unlike Alternative 1, Alternative 2 provides sufficient population capacity countywide to meet assumes growth within 1% of 2036 growth targets countywide, (within 1%) but the UGAs would be undersized by 7-8%. Cumulatively between the cities and UGAs, spillover~~

development and the associated conversion of uses ~~anticipated under Alternative 1~~ is not likely to occur under Alternative 2.

As the cities' Comprehensive Plan Updates are completed, the results should be accounted in the Preferred Alternatives since basic city assumptions in this Draft SEIS are targets plus 5%. If cities anticipate growth closer to their targets and if UGAs remain undersized, then there could be a cumulative undersizing of urban areas, and similar results about spillover pressure into rural areas could apply as for Alternative 1.

Impacts of Alternative 3

Conversion of Uses

Similar to Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would result in conversion of uses primarily in areas of UGA expansion and in urban locations where zoning would be changed to allow increased density and development intensity. However, the effect would be more widespread due to the greater amount of UGA expansion under Alternative 3. Conversion of uses is most likely to occur in the Silverdale area as Urban Low Residential areas are rezoned for Urban High Residential and as additional land is added to the UGA for industrial zoning. In all other UGA expansion areas, conversion is likely to occur as properties currently zoned for rural uses are rezoned for urban residential uses. Overall, Alternative 3 would result in similar types of use conversions as Alternative 2, but over a larger area due to the larger amount of UGA expansion proposed.

Alternative 3 has a countywide population growth that is slightly above targets, but only by 2%; UGAs would be undersized only by 4%. Based on prior County planning efforts, balancing capacity and targets to within 5% of the target is considered a reasonable margin of tolerance. As the cities' Comprehensive Plan Updates are completed, the results should be accounted in the Preferred Alternatives since basic city assumptions in this Draft SEIS are targets plus 5%. If cities anticipate growth closer to their targets and if UGAs remain undersized, then there could be a cumulative undersizing of urban areas, and similar results about spillover pressure into rural areas could apply ~~as for Alternative 1~~.

Regarding employment, at the countywide level, employment is above the target by 12% due to conservative assumptions about cities' targets having a cushion of 5%. However, the UGAs are essentially at a balance point with planned employment.

5.3.2.2. Draft SEIS Relationship to Plans and Policies

The following changes are proposed in response to public comments in Chapter 6. The text is intended to distinguish the growth level assumptions studied countywide, whereas the Unincorporated Urban Growth Area (UGA) growth is expressed in terms of capacity since the County is responsible for sizing those areas.

Impacts of Alternative 1

Growth Management Act

Population and Employment Forecasts

~~Alternative 1 does not provide sufficient population capacity to meet the adopted 2036 growth target.~~ Countywide, Alternative 1 population growth assumptions capacity would be 2% below the adopted target, as described in Chapter 2. Unincorporated UGA population would be 8% below the adopted target for these areas. Lack of development capacity, both

for the county as a whole and within UGAs, could lead to increased development pressures in rural areas, which could have a negative effect on rural land use patterns and development character. Additional discussion of these potential effects is included in Section 3.2.1 – Land and Shoreline Use. In addition, this spillover development in rural areas could pose difficulties for service delivery, due to development being spread over a larger area.

Alternative 1 provides sufficient capacity to meet the adopted 2036 employment growth target. Countywide, Alternative 1 ~~would provide excess~~ assumes employment capacity of 8% above targets, as described in Chapter 2. Unincorporated UGA employment capacity would be 12% above target requirements for these areas. Excess capacity for employment may lead to less efficient employment patterns. Changing some employment land to residential purposes may help alleviate the residential land undersupply and reduce the employment land oversupply.

Impacts of Alternative 2

Growth Management Act

Population and Employment Forecasts

Projected population ~~capacity growth~~ under Alternative 2 is estimated to be within 1% of the adopted 2036 growth target countywide, a deficit of approximately 21 persons, as described in Chapter 2. Unincorporated UGA population would be 7% below the adopted target for these areas. Similar to Alternative 1, insufficient population capacity in UGAs to meet growth targets could result in spillover development in rural areas, which could cause problems for service delivery and adversely affect rural character. See Section 3.2.1 – Land and Shoreline Use for additional discussion of this effect. The 7% difference is close to the 5% margin of tolerance considered for UGAs. Small adjustments in the capacity for housing, such as in mixed use areas or the Silverdale RGC could increase housing capacity and avoid undersizing.

~~Alternative 2 provides sufficient capacity to meet the adopted 2036 employment growth target.~~ Countywide, Alternative 2 ~~would provide excess~~ assumes employment capacity of growth above targets by 18%, as described in Chapter 2. Unincorporated UGA employment capacity would be 17% above target requirements for these areas. Much of the greater supply in employment is based on an intensification of retail and office uses in the Silverdale RGC. If that employment were reduced to a more moderate level, the employment levels would be within 5% of the target for UGAs and considered in balance within a reasonable margin of tolerance.

Impacts of Alternative 3

Growth Management Act

Population and Employment Forecasts

Alternative 3 ~~provides sufficient capacity to meet the adopted~~ assumes growth sufficient to meet the 2036 growth target countywide, but not within unincorporated UGAs.

Countywide, Alternative 3 population ~~capacity~~ assumptions would exceed the adopted target by approximately 2% (a surplus of approximately 1,505 persons), as described in

Chapter 2. Unincorporated UGA population would be 3% below the adopted target for these areas. Similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, insufficient population capacity in UGAs to meet growth targets could result in spillover development rural areas, which could cause problems for service delivery and adversely affect rural character, though to a lesser degree than the other two alternatives, due to the smaller shortfall.

~~Alternative 3 provides sufficient capacity to meet the adopted 2036 employment growth target.~~ Countywide, Alternative 3 ~~would provide excess employment capacity of~~ assumes employment growth of 12% above targets, as described in Chapter 2. Unincorporated UGA employment capacity would be equal to target requirements for these areas.

The following changes are to cross reference analysis of the rural reclassification requests; a paragraph is added following Exhibit 3.2-16.

Impacts of Alternative 3

Growth Management Act

Rural Lands & Character

Exhibit 3.2-16 Reclassification Request List

Applicant	Request
<i>Rural Residential Changes</i>	
Porter	RR/RR to RR
Garland	RW to RR
Trophy Lake Golf Club	RW to RR
McCormick Land Company	RW to RR
Fox-Harbor Rentals	RP to RR
Tallman	RW to RR
<i>Rural to Urban Residential Requests</i>	
Curtiss-Avery	URS to UL
Eldorado Hills, LLC	RR to UR
Harris	RR to UL
Edwards-Mt. View Meadows	RR-UL
<i>Rural Employment Requests</i>	
DJM Construction	RP/RR to NC
Bremerton West Ridge	Request MRO, URS to IND
Cornerstone Alliance Church	RR to RI
Gonzalez	RR to RI
Lee	RP to RCO
Bair	RR to RI
Port Orchard Airport	RI to REC
Merlinco	RR to RCO
Rodgers	RR-RCO

Legend: MRO = Mineral Resource Overlay; NC = Neighborhood Commercial; REC = Rural Employment Center; RCO = Rural Commercial; RI = Rural Industrial; RP = Rural Protection; RR = Rural Residential; RW = Rural Wooded; URS = Urban Reserve; BC = Business Center; HTC = Highway Tourist Commercial; Ind = Industrial; RC = Regional Commercial; UL = Urban Low Residential; UM = Urban Medium Residential; UR = Urban Restricted.

Source: Kitsap County 2015

Consistent with Chapter 2, Alternative 3 would add a Type III LAMIRD designation at Port Orchard Airport (see Staff Report analysis for reclassification request). Addition of the DJM reclassification request to a Type I LAMIRD at George’s Corner would be included (see Staff Report analysis for reclassification request).

5.3.2.3. Draft SEIS Population, Housing, and Employment

No changes.

5.3.2.4. Draft SEIS Transportation

Correct costs on Exhibit 3.2-59 for Alternative 2. No changes to conclusions are anticipated.

Exhibit 3.3-59 summarizes the total cost of the projects recommended countywide. Alternative 1 (No Action) has the highest estimated cost, primarily because it includes improvement of a section of Anderson Hill Road that would require replacement of a railroad trestle. The total cost of recommended improvements under Alternatives 2 and 3 are similar, with Alternative 2 slightly higher.

**Exhibit 3.2-59 Summary of Cost of Roadway Improvements Recommended by 2036
(in \$ Millions)**

	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
North County	\$9.8	\$16.5	\$11.1
Central County ¹	\$107.1	\$76.7	\$76.7
South County	\$48.3	\$46.8 \$43.3	\$46.8
Total	\$165.2	\$140.0 \$136.5	\$134.6

¹ Excludes a cost for a project addressing Silverdale Way, which would be added to all three alternative totals.
Note: Based upon 2015 dollars.

5.3.3. Draft SEIS 3.3. Built Environment: Public Services and Utilities

5.3.3.1. Draft SEIS Public Buildings

No changes.

5.3.3.2. Draft SEIS Fire Protection

Update inventory for North Kitsap Fire and Rescue (NKFR) and Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue (CKFR) in Draft SEIS Table 3.3-11 based on more recent inventory information.

Exhibit 3.3-11 Kitsap County Fire Protection Facilities Inventory

Fire Protection Provider	Number of Stations	WSRB 2012 Fire Rating	Fire Units*	EMS Services	2014 OFM Service Area Population**
North Kitsap Fire and Rescue (NKFR)	5	5	14	Y	19,387
Poulsbo Fire Department	4	4 - Within City Limits 5 - Outside City Limits	13	Y	14,705
Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue (CKFR)	10	4	34	Y	69,753
Bremerton Fire Department	3	3	13	Y	39,410
South Kitsap Fire and Rescue (SKFR)	12	4	34	Y	72,046***

Fire Protection Provider	Number of Stations	WSRB 2012 Fire Rating	Fire Units*	EMS Services	2014 OFM Service Area Population**
North Kitsap Fire and Rescue (NKFR)	5	5	22	Y	19,387
Poulsbo Fire Department	4	4 - Within City Limits 5 - Outside City Limits	13	Y	14,705
Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue (CKFR)	10	4	36	Y	69,753
Bremerton Fire Department	3	3	13	Y	39,410
South Kitsap Fire and Rescue	12	4	34	Y	72,046***

Notes:

* A unit is the combination of vehicle and equipment that responds to a fire or EMS situation, including engines, ladder trucks, water tenders, rescue units, aid cars and ambulances, and rehabilitation units, but not including staff or miscellaneous vehicles.

** The Bremerton Fire Department serves the City of Bremerton, and the Service Area Population is from 2015.

**** The estimate shown is provided by the district. 2014 OFM Service Area Population estimate is 60,688 for the South Kitsap Fire and Rescue District.

Source: North Kitsap Fire and Rescue, 2015; Poulsbo Fire Department Website, 2015; Bainbridge Island Fire Department Website, 2015; Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue, 2015; Bremerton Fire Department, 2015; South Kitsap Fire and Rescue, 2015.

Amend Exhibit 3.3-13 with more recent Fire District response time information.

Exhibit 3.3-13. Response Time Objectives

District / Department	Response Time Objective
Bremerton Fire Department	5 <u>6</u> minute response time, City Services Element
Central Kitsap Fire & Rescue	Turnout time goal: 90 seconds, met 90% of the time. Travel time goals: suburban (fire/EMS 8:00), rural (fire/EMS 12:00), and wilderness areas (fire/EMS 20:00).
North Kitsap Fire & Rescue	The first unit, capable of beginning mitigation of the emergency, arrive on scene within 7:59 minutes of dispatch on 90% of all priority alarms. <u>Structure Fires</u> Turnout Time Goal: 165 seconds (2:45) or better 90% of the time Travel Time Goal First Arriving Engine Company: 7 minutes 50 seconds (7:50) or better 90% of the time <u>EMS (Basic Life Support)</u> Turnout Time Goal: 120 seconds (2:00) or better 90% of the time Travel Time Goal First Arriving BLS Unit with (2) EMT Qualified Personnel: 8 minutes 40 seconds (8:40) or better 90% of the time. <u>EMS (Advanced Life Support)</u>

District / Department	Response Time Objective
	<u>Turnout Time Goal: 120 seconds (2:00) or better 90% of the time</u> <u>Travel Time Goal First Arriving ALS Unit with (1) PM Qualified Personnel: 12 minutes 30 seconds (12:30) or better 90% of the time</u>
Poulsbo Fire Department	Turnout Time: 2:00 minutes for fire and priority 1 and 2 events and 1:30 minutes for medical events. Response time of units to suburban calls for service at 8:00 minutes. Rural response time goals, at 11:00 minutes.
South Kitsap Fire & Rescue	Turnout time, the district has a goal of 90 seconds or less 90% of the time. Travel times for fire responses range from 5:00 minutes to 10:50 minutes depending on the urban, suburban, or rural nature of the call. Travel times for EMS services ranged from 6:20 to 11:15 minutes also depending on the urban, suburban, or rural nature of the call.

Source: Bremerton Fire Department, 2015; Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue, 2015; North Kitsap Fire and Rescue, 2015; Poulsbo Fire Department, 2015; South Kitsap Fire & Rescue, 2015.

5.3.3.3. Draft SEIS Law Enforcement

No changes.

5.3.3.4. Draft SEIS Parks and Recreation

Amend the inventory of existing facilities:

Inventory of Current Facilities

Kitsap County owns approximately ~~11,704~~ 7,278 acres of parkland, and other agencies own approximately 19,847 acres of parkland in the county, as shown in Exhibit 3.3-22. Kitsap County owns 8.5 miles of shoreline access and approximately 100 miles of trails in the county, while other agencies own 18 miles of shoreline access and 57 miles of trails in the county. Park space is generally used by all county residents. Out-of-county and out-of-state visitors and tourists also use a significant portion of these regional sites and facilities.

Exhibit 3.3-22. County-Owned Parks, Shoreline Access, and Trails

Type of Park	Kitsap County Capacity (Acres)	Other Agencies Capacity (Acres)	Total Capacity (Acres)
Natural Resource Areas	1,191	16,699	17,890
Heritage Parks	4,699	0	4,699
Regional Parks	590	2,342	2,932
Community Parks	339	806	1,145
Partnership Properties	459		459
Total Acres	7,278	19,847	27,125
Shoreline Access (Miles)	8.5	18	26.5
Trail Miles (Paved and Unpaved)	100	57	157

Type of Park	Kitsap County Capacity (Acres)	Other Agencies Capacity (Acres)	Total Capacity (Acres)
Natural Resource Areas	5,617	16,699	22,316
Heritage Parks	4,699	0	4,699
Regional Parks	590	2,342	2,932
Community Parks	339	806	1,145
Partnership Properties	459		459
Total Acres	11,704	19,847	31,551
Shoreline Access (Miles)	8.5	18	26.5
Trail Miles (Paved and Unpaved)	100	57	157

Source: Kitsap County Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan, 2012; Kitsap County Parks Department, 2015; BERK, 2015.

A more detailed inventory of parks facilities is included in the Draft CFP under separate cover.

5.3.3.5. Draft SEIS Schools

No changes.

5.3.3.6. Draft SEIS Solid Waste

No changes.

5.3.3.7. Draft SEIS Wastewater

Amend Exhibit 3.3-49, Central Kitsap Wastewater Facilities row as follows:

Exhibit 3.3-49. Kitsap County Public Sewer System Inventory

Name	Collection System		Treatment Plant			Service Area		
	Miles of Pipe (1)	Collection System Existing Conditions	Existing Flow, mgd (1)	Design Flow, mgd (1)	Surplus/Deficit, (mgd)	2015 Population Served	Existing Connections ERU (2)	Surplus/Deficit ERU (3)
KITSAP COUNTY SYSTEMS								
Central Kitsap Wastewater Facilities	145	Several flow capacity and aging infrastructure problems have been identified.	3.74-44	6.0	2.31-56	44,476	14,042	6,240

Amend Exhibit 3.3-50 with updated sewer costs. The relative differences would not change.

**Exhibit 3.3-50. Sewer Cost Comparison by Provider and Alternative
2016-2036 (All Amounts in \$1,000)**

UGA	No Action	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Bremerton (City) – 2015\$	\$225,406\$304,633	\$225,406\$304,633	\$225,406\$304,633
Port Orchard (City) – 2015\$	\$7,470	\$7,470	\$7,470
WSUD* – 2015\$	\$36,410\$31,685	\$31,810 \$27,085	\$31,810\$27,085
Poulsbo (City) – 2015\$	\$9,075\$11,655	\$9,075\$11,655	\$9,075\$11,655
Kitsap County – 2015\$	\$353,816\$338,404	\$348,416\$333,004	\$369,416\$354,004

Note: A capital project list in the Draft Capital Facilities Plan shows approximately \$31,685 for the No Action; and it is assumed the order of magnitude difference would be similar to this table. This would equal \$27,085 for the Action Alternatives. This will be clarified with the capital list associated with a Preferred Alternative.

Source: WSUD 2015; BHC 2015

5.3.3.8. Draft SEIS Stormwater

No changes.

5.3.3.9. Draft SEIS Water Supply

The following change is made to the header of Exhibit 3.3-58.to identify Alternatives 2 and 3.

Exhibit 3.3-58 Relative Growth in Households by Alternative and Water Provider

District	Total HHS 2012	Alt 1 No Action Total HH 2036	% Change Over 2012	Alt 2 Total HH 2036	% Change Over Alt 1	Alt 3 Total HH 2036	% Change Over Alt 1
----------	-------------------	--	-----------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------	------------------------

5.3.3.10. Draft SEIS Energy and Telecommunications

Text on page 3-229 through 3-230 concerning PSE in Kitsap County has been modified to read as follows:

PSE serves over ~~115,000~~ 116,000 electric customers in Kitsap County and maintains over 132 miles of high-voltage transmission and distribution lines throughout the county. (Puget Sound Energy, 2015) (Brobst, 2015)

Power is supplied to western Washington primarily from hydro generating stations along the mid-Columbia River and in Canada. Interregional 230 and 500 kV transmission lines carry power from the generating stations westward to PSE’s and BPA’s transmission switching sub stations ~~and to transmission substations operated by the Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) in the Puget Sound region.~~ The existing electrical facilities inventory in unincorporated Kitsap County consist of the following:

- Transmission Switching Stations – ~~South Bremerton, Long Lake, Port Madison, Bremerton, Foss Corner and Valley Junction.~~
- Transmission Substations– South Bremerton, ~~Bremerton~~ BPA Kitsap (owned and operated by BPA).

- Distribution Substations – Bucklin Hill, Central Kitsap, Chico, Christensen’s Corner, East Port Orchard, Fernwood, Fragaria, Kingston, Manchester, McWilliams, Miller Bay, Murden Cove, Port Gamble, Poulsbo, Rocky Point, Serwold, Sheridan, Silverdale, Sinclair Inlet, South Keyport, Tracyton, US Navy Keyport, Winslow, and Bremerton, Port Madison, and Long Lake. (Last 3 subs have distribution transformers in addition to being transmission switching stations.) ~~Port Gamble, Christensen's Corner, Miller Bay, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, Bucklin Hill, Tracyton, McWilliams, Chico, Sinclair Inlet, South Keyport, Fernwood, Manchester, Long Lake, Fragaria, East Port Orchard, Sheridan, Rocky Point, Poulsbo, Bremerton, Port Madison, Murden Cove, and Winslow, Serwold, Kingston.~~ Some of these substations are within city limits.
- Transmission Lines 115 kV – O'Brien - Long Lake, Foss Corner - Port Madison, South Bremerton - Valley Junction, Murden Cove Tap (Port Madison – Murden Cove), Foss Corner - Port Gamble, BPA Kitsap - Valley Junction, Valley Junction - Foss Corner, South Bremerton – Bremerton, Bremerton - Navy Yard, Kitsap - South Bremerton, Winslow Tap (Port Madison - Winslow), BPA Kitsap - Navy Yard, US Navy Bangor - Foss Corner, South Bremerton - Longlake #2, South Bremerton - Longlake #1, Bremerton – US Navy Keyport, Foss Corner - US Navy Keyport, BPA Kitsap – Bangor (owned by BPA), and BPA Shelton – BPA Kitsap (owned by BPA). ~~Foss Corner - Salisbury Point, Foss Corner - Murden Cove, Port Madison Tap, Valley Junction - Foss Corner, Bremerton - Keyport, Foss Corner - Keyport, South Bremerton - Bremerton, South Bremerton - Valley Junction, O'Brien - Long Lake, South Bremerton - Long Lake, South Bremerton - Fernwood Tap, Fernwood Tie, and Bremerton - Navy Yard. Foss Corner – US Navy at Bangor, Miller Bay to Kingston.~~
- Transmission Lines 230 kV: BPA Shelton - South Bremerton, BPA Shelton – BPA Kitsap #3, and BPA Shelton – BPA Kitsap #4.
- Other Facilities – Command Point Cable Station and Salisbury Point Cable Station.
(Kitsap County, 2012) (Brobst, 2015)

PSE has divided Kitsap County into two sub-areas (north and south) for the purposes of electric facilities planning. The North Kitsap sub-area is generally from Hood Canal in the north to Sinclair Inlet in the south. The South Kitsap sub-area is generally from Sinclair Inlet to the south county boundary. (Kitsap County, 2012)

The north and south sub-areas receive power from a network of 115kV interconnecting transmission sources in the southern part of the county and transmission switching stations in central and northern Kitsap County. A 230 kV transmission source come into Kitsap County via BPA lines to the BPA Kitsap substation in Gorst, then PSE has a short run of 230kV to their South Bremerton Substation. From there 115kV lines transmit power throughout Kitsap County.

Long-range plans are developed by PSE’s ~~Total Energy~~ Electric System Planning Department and are based on electrical growth projections. County population projections produced by the OFM are used to determine new load growth for the next 20 years. Projected load is calculated as the existing load, minus conservation reductions, minus demand side management, plus forecast of new load.

PSE’s future electrical facilities plan is based on an estimated normal peak winter load. PSE plans to construct additional transmission and distribution facilities to meet demand. The

exact timing of individual projects will be determined by the rate of load growth in specific areas. Planned or pending projects are listed below.

Current and Planned Projects

The following information on current and planned facility projects is from (Kitsap County, 2012) and (Brobst, 2015).

BPA Transmission Improvements: BPA is planning to reinforce the Olympic Peninsula with two additional 230 kV transmission lines between the Olympia area and Shelton. This project was completed in 2010.

Text on page 3-231 has been corrected as follows:

North Kitsap 115kV Transmission Line Loop: This project proposes to construct a new line from Kingston Substation west along SR 104 to tap into the 115 kV line between Christensen's Corner and Port Gamble substations. In addition, this project also includes constructing a new line from Port Gamble Substation southeast to also tap into the 115 kV line between Christensen's Corner and Port Gamble substations, at a point just north of Christensen's Corner Substation but south of the tap from Kingston. These two new lines will loop Kingston and Port Gamble substations and provide greater reliability to north Kitsap County. The long term plan for capacity addition targets a new Sunset Substation on a site to the west of the south end of Port Gamble Bay. As of September 2015, this project is in the Planning phase. ~~Foss Corner Salisbury #2 115/230 kV Line: This project will provide service to a future 115/230 kV transmission system line between Salisbury cable station and Foss Corner switching station. A transmission tap to Kingston substation in north Kitsap County will be integrated to form a 115 kV looped transmission to Foss Corner.~~

BPA Kitsap South Bremerton–Foss Corner 115/230 kV Transmission AKA West Kitsap Transmission Project Phase II: The purpose of this project is to build 15 miles of 230 kV transmission line between BPA Kitsap and Bangor. This is the phase II of the West Kitsap project where initially a 230 kV transmission line was constructed and energized at 115-kV between Bangor and Foss Corner substations in 2006. This project would reconnect the new line from BPA Kitsap to Bangor at Bangor and bring this 230-kV line to Foss corner expanding Foss Corner substation to 230-kV bus and 230/115 kV transformation. This would increase the transmission capacity between south Kitsap and north Kitsap Counties by 2020. As of September 2015, this project is in the planning stage. This project will entail constructing a 115/230 kV transmission line between the South Bremerton transmission station and the Foss Corner switching station. The major portion of this line will be located on a right of way parallel to the Kitsap Bangor BPA line. One of the 115/230 kV transmission lines will link the South Bremerton transmission station to the BPA Fairmount transmission substation (Jefferson County) via the Foss Corner switching station and a submarine cable across Hood Canal. A second line from South Bremerton along the corridor will connect to Valley Junction via Silverdale substation. This project is currently in planning.

Long Lake Transmission Loop

This project is designed to improve the reliability of transmission service to south Kitsap County. It expands the existing Long Lake Substation and creates a looped transmission feed and additional capacity between the station and South Bremerton. This project was completed in 2010.

BPA KITSAP – VALLEY JUNCTION #2 115 KV PROJECT

The purpose of this project is to increase transmission capacity between the Bremerton and central Kitsap County areas to address existing system limitations by 2020. This project would also be a source feed for the future substation in the Seabeck area, serving the load growth in central Kitsap County. As of September 2015, this project is in the planning stage.

VALLEY JUNCTION – FOSS CORNER #2 115 KV TRANSMISSION PROJECT

This project proposes to build a second Valley junction – Foss Corner 115 kV transmission line that will make use of the existing transmission from Lemolo Tap to Foss Corner. The plan will re-configure the existing transmission at Lemolo Tap and establish a new Bremerton – Port Madison transmission line. The existing Liberty Bay water crossing will need to be re-built to a double circuit to allow removal of the three-way Tap at Lemolo. As of September 2015, this project is in the development stage.

Silverdale Tap Transmission Extension to Valley Junction: This project improves the reliability of transmission service to the Silverdale area by extending the Silverdale transmission line to Valley Junction switching substation. The project will be staged, beginning with right-of-way acquisition for 115 kV transmission followed by construction of the project as determined by the need date. The purpose of this project is to construct 3 miles of 115-kV transmission line from Valley Junction substation to Silverdale tap and installing new breaker position at the Valley Junction substation. This line eventually becomes part of Kitsap –Valley Junction #2 115-kV line. As of September 2015, this project is in the planning development stage.

FOSS CORNER –PORT MADISON AND PORT MADISON TAP 115 KV TRANSMISSION UPGRADE

The purpose of this project is to rebuild/upgrade Port Madison Tap and Foss Corner - Port Madison 115-kV transmission lines to increase the transmission capacity on the two lines that serves the Kingston area and Bainbridge Island in NE Kitsap County. The 6.5-mile Port Madison Tap transmission line has about 3 miles of small conductor of 397.5 ACSR and the 10-mile Foss Corner-Port Madison transmission line has about 7.2 miles of similar conductor that has winter emergency of 115 MVA. The 397.5 ACSR conductors on the two lines are limiting the load carrying capability of either line when one of the lines is forced out of service. As of September 2015, this project is in the Construction stage.

Bainbridge Island Transmission Reliability and Substation Capacity Improvements: This project timing will be driven by the need for a fourth distribution substation south of Port Madison to serve increased loads on Bainbridge Island. The project will connect the existing Winslow and Murden Cover substations so that power can automatically be restored following a transmission-related outage. Presently, a separate 115 kV transmission line from the Port Madison substation serves each substation (and its customers), without backup capability. As of September 2015, this project is in the planning stage.

Transmission Switching and substations Rebuild

South Bremerton: The purpose of this project is to install a transfer (auxiliary) bus and bus tie switches including a bus tie breaker in South Bremerton Substation. However, considering the station design, it may require significant upgrade to implement an aux bus that includes straightening the existing L-shaped bus. This project was completed in 2013.

Foss Corner: The purpose of this project is to install a transfer (auxiliary) bus and bus tie switches including a bus tie breaker in Foss Corner Substation. The transfer bus and bus tie breaker will allow for greater reliability during planned breaker maintenance or other devices tied to the bus work. The bus tie breaker will serve as a temporary replacement breaker in the event any of the line bays are out of service for scheduled maintenance. The project scope also includes removal of old equipment in the station and preparing the station for future 230-kV. As of September 2015, this project is in the planning stage.

Valley Junction: The purpose of this project is to install a transfer (auxiliary) bus and a bus tie breaker in Valley Junction. The project will most likely require expansion of the existing footprint of the station to allow for installation of the transfer bus. The existing line bays and transmission line gate-away setup should not change as a result of the project. As of September 2015, this project is in the planning stage.

Distribution Substations: Several new distribution substations are planned to serve the forecasted load. In North Kitsap, distribution substations are proposed in Tower, Sunset, Newberry, Werner, Brownsville, Agate Pass, and Fletcher. In South Kitsap, distribution substations are proposed in Helena, Colby, Bethel, Phillips, and Sunnyslope. These projects are currently all in planning.

5.3.3.11. Draft SEIS Library

No changes.

5.4. Draft SEIS Chapter 4 Reclassification Requests

No changes.

5.5. Draft SEIS Chapter 5 Acronyms, Abbreviations, and References

No changes.

5.6. Draft SEIS Appendices

Draft SEIS Appendix G, Draft Reasonable Measures Assessment, is amended with the following clarifications or corrections.

Amend page 19 of Appendix G as follows:

A code change in 2006 changed the minimum Urban Low Residential density from 5 units per acre to 4 units per acre and the maximum density has stayed the same at 10 units per acre. ~~At the time, a Growth Management Hearings Board case identified 4 units per acre as an urban density in Kitsap County.~~ Following the 2012 UGA Sizing and Composition Remand, the County restored a minimum density of 5 units per acre. This change in minimum density in 2006 and 2012 was a code change and not a zone change. Thus, the

changes are not reflected in Exhibit 10. In any case, plat densities are above 5 units per acre, both before and after the minimum density change, as shown in Exhibit 11.

Amend pages 75 and 76 of Appendix G as follows:

Per county examples above, clustering is likely to be used. Parcel reconfiguration has been used in Clark County in some instances. It is not a widely used tool. It may be a beneficial approach when paired with incentives such as reduced permit fees ~~waivers of boundary line adjustment applications~~; it may allow cooperation between adjacent owners (e.g. relatives that own nonconforming lots that would not be subject to lot aggregation) if the program allowed transfers of lots within and across ownership.