

## Chapter 4. Clarifications or Corrections to DEIS Information

This Chapter includes Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) clarifications or corrections based on responses to comments presented in Chapter 5 of this Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) or based on County or consultant review of the DEIS information. The clarifications or corrections are organized in the same order as the DEIS sections and by page numbers. The sources of the clarifications or corrections are noted for each amendment. The clarifications or corrections do not change the relative impacts of the three DEIS alternatives.

### 4.1.1. Clarifications or Corrections Table

The clarifications or corrections are organized in the table below in the same order as the DEIS sections and by page numbers. The sources of the clarifications or corrections are noted for each amendment.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision				Comments
1.	Chapter 1 and 2	1-7 and 2-25	Table 1.4-1 and Table 2.6-3, row titled "Comprehensive Plan Policies", Column "Alternative 2": Change word "innovate" to "innovative"				Corrects misspelling
2.	Chapter 1 and Chapter 2	1-9, Table 1.4-1. Alternatives Comparison  2-26, Table 2.6-4. Overview of Alternatives: Unincorporated Kitsap County	<b>CPP Growth Target (2005–2025)</b>  <b>Employment Growth Capacity Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas<sup>2</sup></b>  <u>Employment land demand in gross acres:</u> <u>total 3,495</u> <u>industrial 2,392</u> <u>commercial 1,103</u>	<b>Alternative 1 (No Action)</b>  Approximately 20,000 jobs, no change in capacity.  Buildable acres in industrial: 82% of total <del>buildable</del> employment acres. Buildable acres in commercial: 18%.  <u>Gross acres of employment:</u> <u>industrial 1,988</u> <u>commercial 547</u>  <u>Under land demand for both Industrial and Commercial land demand</u>	<b>Alternative 2</b>  Approximately 38,000 jobs, 90% over existing capacity.  Buildable acres in industrial: 68%. Buildable acres in commercial: 32%.  <u>Gross acres of employment:</u> <u>industrial 2,196</u> <u>commercial 1,316</u>  <u>Under Industrial land demand: over Commercial land demand</u>	<b>Alternative 3</b>  Approximately 47,000 jobs, 135% over existing capacity.  Buildable acres in industrial: 75%. Buildable acres in commercial: 25%.  <u>Gross acres of employment:</u> <u>industrial 3,276</u> <u>commercial 1,369</u>  <u>Over both Industrial and Commercial land demand</u>	Summarizes information found in DEIS Section 3.2.3 regarding employment acres to augment the summary table in Chapters 1 and 2 that report employment capacity

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
3.	Chapter 1	1-23	<p>Under Vegetation-Countywide, Alternative 3:</p> <p>The total area within unincorporated UGA boundaries would be 57.6 square miles. The extent of potential development and the associated potential impact on vegetation would be greater than under either Alternatives 1 or <del>2</del>3.</p>	Correction of the Alternative under comparison.
4.	Chapter 1 and Chapter 3	1-42 and 3.2-173	<p>Add text to mitigation measure to clarify coordination and inadvertent discovery:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A policy or program could be developed to promote improved ongoing communication and coordination strategies with local Tribes in an effort to better preserve and enhance cultural resources. <u>Such coordination would be in addition to coordination with State agencies.</u> Further amendments to the building and zoning codes could be considered that provide a variety of forms of assistance to developers and property owners to account for the historic and culturally significant sites. <u>Additionally, code amendments should address a process for inadvertent discovery of cultural resources and coordination with State and tribal agencies.</u></li> </ul>	This mitigation measures provides some background that can be considered together with proposed policies LU-130 and LU-131 in Volume I that describe potential code amendments and coordination.
5.	Chapter 1	1-45	<p>Alternative 2, bottom row regarding shoreline views:</p> <p>There would be greater changes in shoreline views, including views from downtown Silverdale, the west side of Dyes Inlet to Chico Bay, at Gilberton, <del>and Brownsville,</del> on Rocky Point, and on Sinclair inlet in West Bremerton. Less potential for view blockage in south Ilahee area, but more somewhat more potential along Ilahee Road north toward Gilberton, where more shoreline would be included in the UGAs.</p>	Correction since Brownsville is not included in a UGA in Alternative 2.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
6.	Chapter 1	1-51	<p><b>Transportation— Silverdale sub-area, Alternative 2 column:</b></p> <p>In the Silverdale sub-area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ~ 7.7 lane-miles of deficient roadways projected under 2025 build-out of Alternative <del>4</del><u>2</u>.</li> <li>▪ 3 intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F under 2025 build-out of Alternative 2.</li> <li>▪ 1 stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at LOS with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</li> <li>▪ <del>4</del><u>2</u> roadway segments projected to need improvement by 2025.</li> <li>▪ Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs in the Silverdale sub-area under Alternative <del>4</del><u>2</u> are \$120,266,000.</li> </ul> <p><b>Transportation— Silverdale sub-area, Alternative 3 column:</b></p> <p>In the Silverdale sub-area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ ~ 10.3 lane-miles of deficient roadways projected under 2025 build-out of Alternative 3.</li> <li>▪ 3 intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F under 2025 build-out of Alternative 3.</li> <li>▪ 1 stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at LOS with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</li> <li>▪ <del>12</del><u>14</u> roadway segments projected to need improvement by 2025.</li> <li>▪ Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs in the Silverdale sub-area under Alternative 3 are \$151,110,000.</li> </ul>	Correct reference to match DEIS Section 3.2.6 results and correct alternative references.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
7.	Chapter 1, Section 1.8.6 Chapter 3, Section 3.2.6	Pages 1-51 Pages 3.2-246, 247 and 249	<p>Add an "X" next to Jackson Ave SE, in south county for Alternative 1 on Table 3.2-116. The cost would increase to \$215,184,000 under Alternative 1 in Table 3.2-118 and in Table 3.2-121 (range would be \$205,910,000 to \$215,184,000). The revenue shortfall on Table 3.2-121 would then equal \$186,358,868 (range of \$177,084,868-\$186,358,868).</p> <p>The cost would increase to \$310,635,000 under Alternative 2 in Table 3.2-118 and in Table 3.2-121 (range now would be \$301,361,000 to \$310,635,000). The revenue shortfall on Table 3.2-121 would then equal -\$281,809,868 (range of \$272,535,868-\$281,809,868).</p> <p>Corresponding edits would be made to page 1-51 in the summary that summarizes number of deficiencies, costs, and revenues.</p>	The Jackson Avenue SE project in South County was identified in the impact analysis (see Figures 3.2-17 and 18) as needing improvement under Alternatives 1 and 2 similar to Alternative 3, but the "X" on Table 3.2-116 was omitted under Alternatives 1 and 2 and also omitted under corresponding tables with costs/revenue. The level of improvement may be less than under Alternative 3; therefore, the cost estimate is shown as a range.
8.	Chapter 2	2-15	<p>Second sentence of CPSGMHB bullet should say: <del>Two</del> <u>Three</u> of the most recent cases are summarized below.</p> <p>Also, second sentence of first sub-bullet should read: The County argued that the update should be completed in 2008, rather than <del>2004</del> <u>2006</u>, because the Plan only became valid in 1998.</p>	Minor text clarification
9.	Chapter 1	1-67	In mitigation measure bullet, change "contact" to "contract"	Misspelling
10.	Chapter 2	2-35	<p>Table 2.6-10. On the Shoreline Element row modify second bullet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Incorporate chapter into updated Plan; no policy content changes. <u>Shoreline Master Program to be updated by 2011 per State law.</u></li> </ul>	Clarify upcoming updates to the SMP.
11.	Chapter 3	3.1-27	<p>Clarify Grovers Creek paragraph:</p> <p>Grovers Creek. ...The Suquamish Tribe operates the Grovers Creek Salmon Hatchery, which serves as a central incubation facility for fall Chinook and <del>chum coho</del> salmon stocks. <u>Coho-Chum</u> salmon, steelhead, and cutthroat trout also occur in the Grovers Creek watershed (Liberty Bay/Miller Bay Watershed Action Plan 1997).</p>	Minor factual corrections

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
12.	Chapter 3	3.1-28	<p>Add the following paragraph to section on Sinclair Inlet:</p> <p><u>Recent studies of the Sinclair Inlet conducted in 2001-02 show use by juvenile salmon (Fresh et al. March 2006). Based on the studies, juvenile Chinook salmon are present in Sinclair Inlet littoral habitats from early spring through early fall, at a minimum. Inlet shorelines are host to juvenile Chinook salmon from throughout the Puget Sound during late spring and summer months, and likely include both hatchery origin and natural origin.</u></p>	Reference recent information on salmonids for more context.
13.	Chapter 3 and Appendix H. Reasonable Measures Overview	<p>Chapter 3: 3.2-78, last paragraph. 3.2-142, first bullet</p> <p>Appendix H: Page H-1 Overview section, 2nd paragraph, third sentence and page 2 Reasonable Measures requirements section, third paragraph, 1st sentence.</p>	The <del>2002 BLR</del> <u>CPSGMHB (case No. 04-3-0009c)</u> did identify an inconsistency between "planned and "actual" development patterns in that more growth was occurring in rural areas than was targeted in the CPPs.	Should be clarified that it was a Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board decision that identified the inconsistency between rural/urban population targets not the BLR.
14.	Chapter 3	3.2-150	Table 3.2-88, East Bremerton and West Bremerton rows, "Additional Residential Reasonable Measures proposed in 10-Year Update" column: should state "Measures 1-8, 10-12" not "Measures 1-8, 11-12."	Match DEIS Appendix H, UGAMA policies would apply to East Bremerton and West Bremerton.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
15.	Chapter 3	3.2-160	<p>Add treaty text after last paragraph under "Ethnographic section":</p> <p><u>The 1855 Treaty of Point Elliot outlined articles of agreement between the United States and the Suquamish Tribe. Under the articles of the treaty the Tribe ceded certain areas of its aboriginal lands to the United States and reserved for its use and occupation certain lands, rights and privileges and the United States assumed fiduciary obligations, including, but not limited to, legal and fiscal responsibilities to the Tribe.</u></p> <p><u>An aboriginal right retained under the Treaty includes the immemorial custom and practice to hunt, fish and gather within usual and accustomed grounds and stations, which was the basis of the Tribe's source of food and culture. Treaty-reserved resources situated on and off the Port Madison Indian Reservation include, but are not limited to, fishery resources situated within the Suquamish Tribe's adjudicated usual and accustomed (U&amp;A) fishing area. The Suquamish Tribe U&amp;A extends well beyond Reservation boundaries. The U&amp;A fishing places of the Suquamish Tribe include marine waters of Puget Sound from the northern tip of Vashon Island to the Fraser River in Canada, including Haro and Rosario Straits, the streams draining into the western side of Puget Sound and also Hood Canal. The U&amp;A of the Suquamish Tribe also extends west into Jefferson County, and south into Mason County. Kitsap County is within Suquamish Tribe's U&amp;A.</u></p> <p><u>On February 12, 1974, U.S. District Court Judge Boldt ruled that treaty rights entitled Indian Tribes to half the harvestable fish running in their traditional waters, a right which was later affirmed to include shellfish and other natural resources. The rule established Washington State's federally recognized Indian Tribes as co-managers (with Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife) of fisheries resources within their U&amp;A fishing areas.</u></p>	Reference treaty information for more context.
16.	Chapter 3	3.2-247 to 3.2-249	<p>Tables 3.2-118 through 3.2-121</p> <p>Include footnote that indicates summary of 2025 roadway improvements are related to capacity projects and does not include maintenance or preservation improvements.</p>	Clarifies intent of tables.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
17.	Chapter 3	3.3-71	<p>Table 3.3-44</p> <p>SW Generation Rate (lbs/cap/day) should be revised:</p> <p><del>4.6</del> <u>6.4</u></p> <p>SW Tons Generated per Year should be revised:</p> <p><del>205,504</del> <u>285,918</u></p> <p>Add the following to Footnote 1:</p> <p><u>The rate of 6.4 lbs/cap/day accounts for residential, commercial, and industrial waste. A rate of 4.6 lbs/cap/day accounts for residential waste only.</u></p> <p>Add the following to Footnote 2:</p> <p><u>If calculated with the 4.6 lbs/cap/day rate for residential waste only, the yearly tons of solid waste generated, not including recycled waste, is 205,504.</u></p>	The rate of 4.6 lbs/cap/day shown in the DEIS accounts for residential waste only. The rate of 6.4 lbs/cap/day accounts for residential, commercial, and industrial waste and is the rate used in the CFP.
18.	Chapter 3	3.3-72 first full paragraph	Change "contact" to "contract"	Misspelling



No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
19.	Chapter 3	3.3-72	<p>Add to the analysis of the No Action Alternative as follows:</p> <p>An increase in unincorporated County population of 48,782 under this alternative would result in an increased demand for solid waste service. The County's rate for projecting demand <u>from residences</u> is 4.6 lbs/capita/day of solid waste production. Countywide population of 319,729 under this alternative would result in a countywide total of 1,470,753 pounds (735 tons) per day of solid waste production by 2025 <u>accounting for residential waste only. Accounting for residential, commercial, and industrial waste, this alternative would result in a countywide total of 2,046,266 pounds (1,023 tons) per day of solid waste production by 2025.</u></p> <p>The recycling rate in Kitsap County is currently 1.0 lb/capita/day. If this rate were maintained, it would result in 319,729 recycled pounds (160 tons) per day by 2025.</p> <p><b>Silverdale Sub-Area</b></p> <p>Under this alternative, the sub-area would accommodate increased population and densities. These densities would allow for increased efficiency in solid waste collection by reducing the miles traveled for curbside service. The population growth in the Silverdale sub-area (3,466 people) would result in an increase of 15,944 pounds (7.9 tons) per day of solid waste <u>accounting for residential waste only, or 22,182 pounds (11.1 tons) per day accounting for residential, commercial, and industrial waste,</u> and 3,466 of recycled pounds (1.7 tons) per day. This growth in demand is accounted for in the countywide totals under this alternative.</p>	Accounts for solid waste generation from commercial and industrial uses.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
20.	Chapter 3	3.3-72 and 3.3-73	<p data-bbox="764 302 1163 324">Add to the analysis of Alternative 2 as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="764 350 1556 537">A population increase of 56,869 in unincorporated Kitsap County under Alternative 2 would result in a greater increase in demand for solid waste service than under Alternative 1. A countywide population of 327,816 would result in a countywide total of 1,507,954 pounds (754 tons) per day of solid waste production by 2025 <u>accounting for residential waste only. Accounting for residential, commercial, and industrial waste, this alternative would result in a countywide total of 2,098,022 pounds (1,049 tons) per day of solid waste production by 2025.</u></p> <p data-bbox="764 563 1528 613">If the current recycling rate were maintained, by 2025 it would result in 327,816 recycled pounds (164 tons) per day.</p> <p data-bbox="764 639 953 662"><b>Silverdale Sub-Area</b></p> <p data-bbox="764 688 1556 927">Population in the sub-area would be greater than under Alternative 1. Densities in downtown Silverdale would be greater than under both Alternatives 1 and 3. These densities would allow for greater efficiency in solid waste collection than under the other alternatives by reducing the miles traveled for curbside service. The population growth in the Silverdale sub-area, 6,973, would result in an increase of 32,076 pounds (16.0 tons) per day of solid waste <u>accounting for residential waste only, or 44,627pounds (22.3 tons) per day accounting for residential, commercial, and industrial waste</u>, and 6,973 recycled pounds (3.5 tons) per day. This growth in demand is accounted for in the countywide totals under this alternative.</p>	Accounts for solid waste generation from commercial and industrial uses.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
21.	Chapter 3	3.3-73  Paragraphs under Impacts of Alternative 3	<p>Add to the analysis of Alternative 3 as follows:</p> <p>A population increase of 75,035 in the unincorporated county under this alternative would result in a greater increase in demand for solid waste service than in either Alternatives 1 or 2. Countywide population of 346,031 under this alternative would result in a countywide total of 1,591,743 pounds (796 tons) per day of solid waste production by 2025 <u>accounting for residential waste only. Accounting for residential, commercial, and industrial waste, this alternative would result in a countywide total of 2,214,598 pounds (1,107 tons) per day of solid waste production by 2025.</u></p> <p>If the current recycling rate were maintained, by 2025 it would result in 346,031 recycled pounds (173 tons) per day.</p> <p><b>Silverdale Sub-Area</b></p> <p>Population in the Silverdale Sub-Area under Alternative 3 would be greater than under Alternatives 1 and 2. Densities in downtown Silverdale would be somewhat lower than under Alternative 2, but greater than under Alternative 1. As under Alternative 2, these densities would allow for increased efficiency in solid waste collection by reducing the miles traveled for curbside service, but to a somewhat lesser degree. The population growth in the Silverdale sub-area, 15,677, would result in an increase of 72,115 pounds (36 tons) per day of solid waste <u>accounting for residential waste only, or 100,333 pounds (50.2 tons) per day accounting for residential, commercial, and industrial waste</u>, and 15,677 of recycled pounds (7.8 tons) per day. This growth in demand is accounted for in the countywide totals under this alternative.</p>	Accounts for solid waste generation from commercial and industrial uses.
22.	Chapter 3	3.3-73  last bullet	Change "contact" to "contract"	Misspelling
23.	Chapter 3	3.3-78	Navy Yard City (Sewer District #1) row, 2005 population served column: replace 3,228 with 2,947	Match Table SS.1 on page 57 of Draft Capital Facilities Plan, Volume 1, Appendix A.
24.	Chapter 3	3.3-90	<p>First full paragraph, first sentence:</p> <p>Based on the current estimate of surplus ERUs and planned improvements, the capacities of the individual wastewater systems are estimated to be adequate to accommodate the wastewater treatment demand of the projected population growth under Alternative <del>2</del>.</p>	Corrects reference to say Alternative 2 since discussion is under that Alternative.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
25.	Chapter 3	3.3-114	Table WS.1-2 and Table 3.3-48: Modify existing connections for North Perry to equal 6,275 not 7,110	Factual correction. North Perry indicates that 7,110 is the number of projected connections in Year 2012.
26.	Chapter 3	3.3-119	Section Describing North Perry service area:  North Perry Avenue Water District. ...Silverdale Water District bounds North Perry Avenue Water District to the west. The long-range plan for the <u>North Perry Avenue and Silverdale</u> <del>two</del> districts is to enter into an agreement to intertie strictly for emergency use. ...  <u>KPUD bounds North Perry Avenue Water District to the north.</u> At the end of 1989, the KPUD took over a small section of the north end of the North Perry Avenue Water District. ...	Minor clarifications to water district boundaries and agreements.
27.	Chapter 3	3.3-122	Last paragraph, second sentence:  Planning for increased water demand in areas served by Group A water systems occurs through district comprehensive water plans, which are required to be updated every <u>65</u> years.	Factual Correction – water system plans developed every 6 years not every five years.
28.	Chapter 3	3.3-130	First paragraph under “Existing Facilities”, last sentence:  The existing electrical facilities inventory in <del>unincorporated</del> Kitsap County consists of the following.	Factual correction – PSE facilities listed serve all of Kitsap County.
29.	Appendix C	TAZ spreadsheet for Alternative 3	Provide correct Alternative 3 figures. The correct Alternative 3 population numbers are shown in FEIS Appendix D, reflecting the numbers tested in the model for the DEIS.	As noted in DEIS Appendix C, rural wooded population was distributed based on one-mile rings around service areas. The detailed population numbers for Alternative 3 should reflect those tested in mid-June 2006 rather than earlier numbers since the “ring” centroid near Bremerton was slightly shifted. This shifted some rural population a little between neighboring TAZs, but did not affect total growth numbers nor figures for UGAs.

No.	DEIS Section / Chapter	DEIS Page No.	DEIS Correction/Revision	Comments
30.	Appendix H	H-1 to H-18 Personius Report pages 8-11	Sort reasonable measures by which are augmenting adopted measures and which are new measures. See FEIS Appendix C.	Assists in implementation clarify augmented and new measures.
31.	Appendix H	H-1 Personius Report page 3	Page H-1, third paragraph, first sentence and Personius Report Page 3, second paragraph, first sentence:  In 2004, the County amended the 2002 BLR Report to <del>adopt</del> <u>identify</u> a set of "reasonable measures" meant to help increase consistency between actual development and that envisioned in the County's Plan.	Minor clarification
32.	Appendix K	Page K-4 and Table K-4	Change Table Note to say (WSDOT 2002) instead of (WSDOT 2006)	Minor correction