



KITSAP COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

DATE: Wednesday, July 20, 2022

TIME: 6:00 PM - 8:00 PM

LOCATION: This meeting will be conducted via **Zoom**.

Zoom link will be posted on the [home page](#) of Kitsap County Parks website on the day of the meeting. The link is the bottom right-hand side under the heading: **Upcoming Parks Advisory Board Meeting**.

Pre-Meeting: Virtual meeting format, information, and instructions

- I. Welcome & Introductions
- II. Adoption of the June 15, 2022 meeting minutes
- III. Public Comment (3-minute limit/person)
- IV. Special Presentations/Reports
 - a. Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Framework *Alex Wisniewski*
 - i. Project Site: <http://portgambleforestpark.com/>
- V. Parks Report
 - a. Director's Report *Alex Wisniewski*
- VI. Sub Committee Appointments *Board*
- VII. Sub Committee Reports *Board*

Sub Committee	Type	Focus Area	PAB Members	Parks Staff (may vary by topic)
Finance & Budget	Standing (per by laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating Budget • Funding Opportunities 	Linda Berry-Maraist Grady Martin Jon Pearson	Parks Director
Capital Projects & Parks	Standing (per by laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Projects Program • M&O Program 	Larry Walker Nancy Whitaker Grady Martin Jon Pearson	Capital Projects Planner M&O Supervisor
Community Outreach & Visitor Services	Ad Hoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events and Rentals Program • Marketing • Volunteer Program • Youth Engagement 	Nancy Whitaker Amy Lawrence Amy Smalley Lisa Hurt	Marketing & Events Supervisor Natural Resources Supervisor
Planning & Property	Ad Hoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Program • Natural Resources Program • Land Acquisition & Divestiture • Park Code 	Larry Walker Linda Berry-Maraist Amy Lawrence Amy Smalley Joanne Clark Lisa Hurt	Parks Planner Natural Resources Supervisor

- VIII. District Representative Reports:
 - a. Old Business
 - b. New Business
- IX. Adjournment

**KITSAP COUNTY PARKS ADVISORY BOARD
JUNE 15, 2022
MEETING MINUTES**

Remarks for the beginning of the remote Advisory Board Meeting were read.

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 PM by the Parks Advisory Board Chair, Joanne Clark.

Introductions were conducted around the room.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

***ACTION:** Linda Berry-Marist moved for the approval of May 18, 2022, meeting minutes.
Discussion: Correction of minutes; Beverly Parson requests open public meetings for Port Gamble Masterplan prior to being sent to Kitsap County Commissioners. Lisa Hurt seconded the motion with correction. MOTION CARRIED.*

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

None

PARKS REPORT

- a. Wicks Lake Forest Stewardship Plan
Natural Resources Manager, Arno Bergstrom, presented the Wicks Lake Forest Stewardship Plan.
- b. Director's Report
Parks Director, Alex Wisniewski, presented the May 2022 Directors Report.

SUBCOMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS

Parks Advisory Board members volunteered for the subcommittees as follows:

Proposed Structure	Type	Focus Area	PAB Members
Finance & Budget	Standing (per by-laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating Budget • Funding Opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linda Berry-Marist • Grady Martin
Capital Projects & Parks	Standing (per by-laws)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Projects Program • M&O Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry Walker • Nancy Whitaker • Grady Martin
Community Outreach & Visitor Services	Ad Hoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events and Rentals Program • Marketing • Volunteer Program • Youth Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nancy Whitaker • Amy Lawrence • Amy Smalley
Planning & Property	Ad Hoc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Program • Natural Resources Program • Land Acquisition/Divestiture • Park Code 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Larry Walker • Linda Berry-Marist • Amy Lawrence • Amy Smalley • Joanne Clark

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

- Discussion on subcommittee appointments to evenly distribute roles. Will be tabled for discussion at the next meeting.
- Alex Wisniewski reported there has been one subcommittee meeting for community outreach and visitor services.

DISTRICT REPRESENTATIVE REPORTS

- Linda Berry-Marist: Port Gamble Forest Stewards met to discuss the masterplan, new attendees were at the meeting, reviewed construction projects. Discussion on non-profits and how to “hold” funds for the diverse needs of Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park. Suggestion on utilizing the current parks foundation, utilizing North Kitsap Trails, or forming a new non-profit. Concern that the existing foundation is for the use of general parks projects. Reported update on new signage and park maps (“you are here signs”). Nancy Whitaker noted Newberry Hill Heritage Park Stewardship Group has a current non-profit along with other larger parks within the department.
- Nancy Whitaker: Reported on Newberry Hill Heritage Park donation operations. Reported on dedication of area of the park. Discussion on posting parking time limits at Newberry Hill Heritage Park.

OLD BUSINESS

- Anderson Point Park – Parks Department staff are coordinating with Public Works and DCD coordinate the completion of the parking lot at Anderson Point Park.
- Discussion on new kiosk and stairs being installed at Olalla Bay Boat ramp.
- Discussion on ways to present Sound to Olympics trail information to the public.

NEW BUSINESS

No new business was discussed.

ADJOURNMENT

***ACTION:** Jon Pearson moved to adjourn the meeting. Grady Martin seconded the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 7:51 PM.*

PARKS ADVISORY BOARD ATTENDANCE

PAB MEMBERS	STAFF	PUBLIC
Joanne Clark, Chair	Alex Wisniewski	Martha Burke
Linda Berry-Maraist	Brian Hauschel	
Lisa Hurt	Arno Bergstrom	
Grady Martin	Chuck Cuzzetto	
Nancy Whitaker		
Jon Pearson		



Parks Department
1195 NW Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311
Mailing address: 614 Division, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366
Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385
www.kitsapgov.com/parks

Alex Wisniewski, Director

Director's Report

Date: 7/20/2022
To: Parks Advisory Board
From: Alex Wisniewski, Parks Director

Administration Program

Staffing

Current status of hiring vacant positions:

	Position	Status
1.	Parks Director	Hired. Start Date: 1-19-2021
2.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 2-1-2021
3.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 2-3-2021
4.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 2-8-2021
5.	Office Support Specialist (Events)	Hired. Start Date: 3-1-2021
6.	Office Support Specialist (Events)	Hired. Start Date: 7-19-2021
7.	Events Coordinator	Hired. Start Date: 8-16-2021
8.	Volunteer Coordinator	Hired. Start Date: 9-13-2021
9.	Parks M&O Supervisor	Hired. Start Date: 9-13-2021
10.	Fiscal Support Tech	Hired. Start Date: 9-20-2021
11.	Events Specialist	Hired. Start Date: 1-3-2022
12.	Office Support Specialist (Events)	Hired. Start Date: 1-24-2022
13.	Public Relations & Communications Coordinator	Hired. Start Date: 2-22-2022
14.	M&O Crew Supervisor	Hired. Start Date: 2-28-2022
15.	M&O Crew Supervisor	Hired. Start Date: 2-28-2022
16.	Volunteer Coordinator	Hired. Start Date: 4-25-2022
17.	M&O Lead (Facilities)	Hired. Start Date: 5-9-2022
18.	M&O Lead (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 5-9-2022
19.	M&O Lead (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 5-9-2022
20.	M&O Lead (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 5-9-2022
21.	M&O Worker (Events)	Hired. Start Date: 6-13-2022
22.	Office Support Specialist (Admin)	Hired. Start Date: 6-21-2022
23.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 7-5-2022
24.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Hired. Start Date: 7-11-2022
25.	Parks Planner	Hired. Start Date: 7-18-2022
26.	M&O Worker (Events)	Hired. Start Date: 7-18-2022
27.	Office Support Assistant (Events)	Hired. Start Date: 8-1-2022
28.	Capital Projects Planner	Interviews held on 7-15-2022
29.	Events Specialist	Posted, closes on 7-25-2022
30.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Filling vacancy with seasonal hire for summer
31.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Filling vacancy with seasonal hire for summer
32.	M&O Worker (Parks)	Filling vacancy with seasonal hire for summer

Capital Projects Program

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park – ride park and parking lots

The mountain bike ride park is approximately 70% complete. Work has stopped for the dry summer months but will resume in the fall with the return of the rains and moisture. Completion for the ride park is targeted for the end of the year.

The SDAP permit for the Stottlemeyer parking lot and trailhead remains in DCD’s review process.

The SDAP permit for the ride park parking lot and trailhead have been submitted to DCD.

Events and Facilities Rental Program

Events and Rentals

The Events team has been very busy with continuous community building and athletic field rentals and, on average 2-3 events at the Fairgrounds and Events Center each week. Needless to say, it’s been a busy! Things will shift a bit in August when the fairgrounds are largely handed over to the Kitsap Fair and Stampede Association (KFSA) for County Fair preparations. Parks staff play a role in this for grounds work, equipment distribution, and working with KFSA to troubleshoot any issues that may arise.

BoCC-Sponsored Events

Event	Status
<i>Martin Luther King Jr. Day</i>	Placeholder on the calendar for 2023.
<i>Military Appreciation Day</i>	Placeholder on the calendar for 2023
<i>FARM Days</i>	CANCELED – 2022, event request submitted for 2023
<i>United Way Day of Caring</i>	This event has indicated they will not use the Fairgrounds facilities in 2022 as they have in past years.
<i>Veterans Day Ceremony</i>	Placeholder on the calendar for November 2022; event application not yet submitted.
<i>Toys for Tots</i>	Placeholder on the calendar for December 2022; event application not yet submitted.

Maintenance & Operations Program

Anderson Point Park

The contract for the gate replacement is complete, Parks is working with the contractor on the scheduling and installation of the gate system. Until the parts come in, the contractor will be applying for electrical permits needed for the installation.

Buck Lake

All County Septic was hired to map out the septic tanks and drain field locations for the Hansville Community Center. During the mapping/inspections, necessary repairs were discovered that may require a complete re-build of the system. All County Septic is now working with the Greater Hansville Community Center (GHCC) board to facilitate the repairs since this system services the community center building only. GHCC will hire an engineer to assist with designing the new system. The area under review for the new drain



Parks Department

1195 NW Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311
Mailing address: 614 Division, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366
Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385
www.kitsapgov.com/parks

Alex Wisniewski, Director

field lies within the boundaries of a 1973 RCO grant, Parks has discussed this with RCO staff and awaits their response.

Kitsap County Fairgrounds & Events Center

Parks staff are gearing up grounds and facility maintenance in preparation for various events and the upcoming Kitsap County Fair! Activities include vegetation management, hazard tree removal, rental equipment repairs, and facility cleaning.

Rental Properties

Parks owns five residential homes on park properties, which are managed through a contract with Kitsap Property Management (KPM).

- The house at Calvinwood is currently vacant and various repairs are underway. The house will not be occupied until the remaining repairs are complete; they include gutter repairs, interior mold mitigation, drywall repairs, door repairs, etc. Kitsap Property Management has had contractors out in the past few weeks to provide bids in the past few weeks to provide bids. Parks Department is awaiting the bids for review.
- The house at Guillemot Cove is now occupied.

Homeless Response

Parks has been working with the HEART team to formalize a policy to address the vehicles that have been staying at the former Silverdale Community Center site. M&O has mowed the vegetation at this site, that was a concern from the Sheriff's department, for sight line issues as they respond to calls. Parks has also posted No Parking signs as well as No Trespassing signs on the property. The HEART team, as well as the outreach team, have posted signage for the removal of the vehicles in early August. In addition to this location, Parks is working with the HEART team to respond to overnight parking at Island Lake Park and Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park.

Natural Resources Program

Forest Stewardship Program

Square Lake Park

- Ecologically based selective thinning at Square Lake is nearing complete, it is anticipated the work will be finished in August.

Wicks Lake

- Review of the Wicks Lake Park Forest Stewardship Plan has largely been completed. It was shared with neighbors at community meeting at the park on June 7, 2022 and with the Parks Advisory Board (PAB) in July; the PAB unanimously recommended it move

forward for Commissioner consideration; it is on the BoCC's 7/25/2022 meeting agenda. Parks staff will provide a presentation on the plan.

Volunteer Program

June Activity: 24 work parties

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park

- Trail maintenance of Secret Squirrel trail with volunteers from United Way's Day of Caring.
- Invasive vegetation removal (Scotch Broom Brigade).
- Rotary and North Kitsap Trails Association mowed and trimmed shrubs, serviced parking lot and Kiosk along the Bluff trail.

Hansville Greenway

- Invasive species removal and trail widening of the connector trail to the new neighboring parcel recently acquired by Great Peninsula Conservancy.

North Kitsap Heritage Park

- Trail development along the powerline trail corridor.
- Re-route of Bay Ridge Trail.

Newberry Hill Heritage Park

- Construction of a replacement trail puncheon completed with support from students from Klahowya Secondary School, United Way's Day of Caring volunteers and Parks staff.
- Central Kitsap High School Football team removed Scotch Broom along the Old Loop Trail.

Banner Forest Heritage Park

- Conducted trail brushing along the NE side of the park.
- Mountaineers conducted two days of trail maintenance along several trails.

South Kitsap Regional Park

- Installation of a new footbridge across a creek and construction of turnpikes with help from Youth Build is in progress, nearing completion.

Chico Salmon Park

- Invasive weed removal and trail work performed.

Elrands Point Preserve

- Removal of invasive plants, litter picking, trail brushing, weedeating and mowing.

Howe Farm

- Students from South Kitsap High School's Club Interact program continue to work installing an ADA trail – it is nearly complete. The project was assisted by Port Orchard Rotary Club.

Anderson Landing Preserve

- Volunteers performed trail brushing work, repaired a bench and installed new split-rail fencing.

Guillemot Cove

- Trail brushing and tree removal.

A Quiet Place Park

- Trail maintenance, brushing work, tree removal.

Nick's Lagoon

- Tree removal, trail brushing, graffiti and vandalism repairs to building.

Harper Park

- 50 volunteers for United Way Day of Caring, focused efforts on invasive plant removal, trash collection, and garden bed care.



Parks Department

1195 NW Fairgrounds Road, Bremerton, WA 98311
Mailing address: 614 Division, MS-1, Port Orchard, WA 98366
Phone (360) 337-5350 • Fax (360) 337-5385
www.kitsapgov.com/parks

Alex Wisniewski, Director

Planning Program

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park - framework

The draft framework has been posted on the project website since February 28, 2022 for public review and comment. Since then, it has been presented/shared with stakeholders, Tribes, focus groups, the Parks Advisory Board, and the Board of County Commissioners (BoCC) to answer questions and receive comments. All comments have been compiled, reviewed and recorded by the project team and are being used to guide edits to the draft framework. On July 11, 2022 the framework, comments, and an “FAQ” document was presented to the BoCC to open an official public hearing period; public comments continue to be received. The same materials will be shared with the Parks Advisory Board (PAB) on July 20, 2020. Draft edits to the framework language are targeted to be presented to the BoCC and PAB in August.

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Comments Matrix



Name	Comment	Action	Response
General Comments			
Judy Willott	The draft master plan is an extraordinary work, with enough details to keep us going for years. I especially appreciate the work on ecological restoration and plans for including restoration work with colleges and universities. It is critical that this body of work not just be accepted as a plan and then put on the shelf. How do we keep it alive and adapting to changes over time? Can required forest thinning fund the restoration?	Comment Noted	Noted, no edit recommended

<p>Lynn Schorn</p>	<p>1. Outreach to the public has not been limited. There have been 4 community meetings. The process has been open to all members of the community. This Master planning process has not gone on for 10 years by park planners and consultants. The PGFHP master planning has been a year in process since acquisition of a Public Facilities District Grant to fund it. If you are a user of the park, you will have seen invitations to participate in Community meetings at parking areas, trailheads, through social media notices, county park notices, etc.</p> <p>2. A SEPA assessment has been completed with all of the appropriate environmental DCD and County permitting for the building of the Ride Park, which took over 7 years to complete from the receipt of the State RCO Grant to purchase the ride park land in 2015. Ongoing permitting for building of parking lots, bathroom facilities in accordance with county permitting structure are being completed as the parking lots, STO projects have and are being publicly funded through grant acquisition.</p> <p>3. and 4. Further environmental, watershed, animal habitat etc. analysis does indeed need to be completed as is clarified in the masterplan. The scope of what you are suggesting and what the masterplan identifies is the need for future funding to complete all that is needed with the intention to balance conservation and recreation.</p> <p>The goal of the masterplan is to balance recreation and ecological restoration following timber harvest. As the park which has been a tree farm for over 100 years goes through its harvest transition to becoming a regenerative, healthy forest, it is difficult to take a survey of plants, animals, etc as transitions will take decades. Perhaps, KEC would be better served to support the purchase of trees as they stand now? www.ourforestfund.org.</p> <p>5. Conservation efforts through Kitsap County Forestry, KC Parks and thousands of volunteer hours have and will continue to be in place: scotch broom removal, tree planting, further purchase of trees through grant acquisition, and surveys of the ecology of the park as it is now and moves into the future. The park is 3500 acres with trails built by mountain bikers, Washington Trails Association, walkers, runners, horse users and is meant to be a park for all. If any of your constituents want to assist in trail maintenance, tree planting, scotch broom and other invasive plant removal there are opportunities every day of the week. FYI, also ecosystem planning and restoration is currently assisted by and through Western Washington University, Olympic College, Wilderness Integration Project(Wild Society) through education and involvement of youth and adults.</p> <p>6. Again, the park plan is and was intended for all users. Yes, the northern 170 acres is focused on mountain bike users. FYI, in 2015, The Ride Park land was purchased with a State Recreation and Conservation Grant- \$500,000.00, which the County partially matched which allowed purchase of the land and the trees at the culmination of the Capital Campaign. Other than this acreage with trees and 500 acres on the NE portion of the park, all of the rest of the timber tracts will be harvested one more time until 2024, which challenges conservation,</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Response to other comments, no edits recommended</p>
--------------------	---	----------------------	---

	<p>erosion, preservation, wildlife habitat and all other ecological factors.</p> <p>7. Yes, multi-user trails as well as safety considerations have been, are, and will be continued to be discussed through all volunteer mechanisms- PGFHP Stewardship Committee, North Kitsap Trails Association, Kitsap County Parks, Emergency Services through improved mapping, community outreach and volunteer work now and into the future.</p> <p>8. The STO(Sound to Olympics)'s design through the adopted North Kitsap Trails Plan(2010) is meant for its intended connections and linkages to become part of the greater Rails to Trails cross state and cross the national trail systems. Its North Kitsap routing is intended to link the ferries with the Hood Canal Bridge.</p> <p>As this process was begun in 2007, its focus was on acquisition, purchase of land available for sale by Pope Resources in North Kitsap County. Of course the goal is to also link with central and south parts of Kitsap County with a north-south route, as well. Perhaps your constituents living in central and south Kitsap County can start working on these linkages?</p> <p>9. The S'Klallam and Suquamish tribes have and will continue to be consulted. Their input, participation and involvement have been integral to the entire process from the beginning. Both tribes are and have been part of the land's history and story- past, present and future. As this is their ancestral land, it is required that they are consulted.</p> <p>10. OPG, Pope Resources and Rayonier are community members. Economics, balance of conservation and recreation are a constant part of our community lands moving forward. As a member of the North Kitsap Community, I would like to see action items of intentional proactive movement for the enhancement of our community and its environment move us all forward toward goals of assisting in that balance of economics, conservation/restoration and recreation into the future.</p>		
--	--	--	--

<p>Tania Issa, Kingston resident, on behalf of my husband Antoine and our children Oliver, Noel, Dorian, Lad, and Quinten Issa</p>	<p>Dear County Commissioners,</p> <p>I am writing to thank you for the extraordinary efforts undertaken to solicit public input from a wide variety of citizens and users of these magnificent trails. Your stated efforts to preserve the cultural, environmental and historic legacy of this forest while allowing public use is well reflected already in your draft Master Plan.</p> <p>Our family of seven includes 5 children who are entering young adulthood and who hope to raise their own families in Kingston. Our family has collectively logged many thousands of miles on these trails hiking and biking over the past decade. On these trails, our family has deepened their values for conservation and stewardship while improving our physical and mental health. Not a week goes by where one or more of us enjoy both the solace AND exhilaration offered by the PG Trails.</p> <p>One of the things we love most about the trails is the vast community of hikers, bikers, and equestrian users who share well wishes as they pass. The trails are used across a pleasing variety of age groups and fitness levels. We are just as likely to see babies in strollers and toddlers taking their first uphill climb as we are to see octogenarians walking their dogs or getting in a little rehab as they recover from knee or hip surgery. Whether or not masks were required during the pandemic, the smiles of everyone we passed were mirrored ear to ear. There simply is no happier place is North Kitsap County.</p> <p>We are especially grateful for the creative and tireless volunteer crew organized by Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance who build and maintain the vast network of public trails amidst the rainy/cold seasons and logging activities. It's just a wonder what has been accomplished thus far and what is dreamed for the future.</p> <p>Thank you sincerely.</p> <p>Tania Issa, Kingston resident, on behalf of my husband Antoine and our children Oliver, Noel, Dorian, Lad, and Quinten Issa</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edit recommended</p>
<p>Jim & Marilyn DeRoy</p>	<p>We are writing in regards to the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Master Plan. We have been involved in this park, as well as others in the county, helping to build and maintain trails and structures, as well as to install signs. As far as options related to the master plan, we would like the goals of the park to focus on conservation and restoration of the natural resources, with the continuation of light recreation - hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding. We feel that the plan options allowing for construction of commercial venues, various buildings, and campgrounds are not in line with these goals and would be a detriment to the biodiversity and wildlife corridors that this park could otherwise offer.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edit recommended. As the largest locally-owned park in the state and over 3 times the size of any other County Park, the Park has opportunities to serve multiple interests without creating conflicts. The Framework proposes more than 93% of the Park be focused on conservation</p>

			and passive recreation with just over 40 acres of the 3500 proposed for new educational and recreation uses. These uses were proposed in areas that are previously logged, away from key environmental features and are focused in the periphery of the park reducing vehicle intrusions.
David Vliet	I would request that you all extend the period for public comment on the PGHP Draft Master plan. The draft for PGHP just came out this month, and the citizens of Kitsap County need to have more time to weigh in on this important plan. Many of the decisions on this plan will have permanent environmental implications for the county's future. At the least, a SEPA assessment for the entire park area needs to be done to make sure we get this right. I have numerous other concerns with regards to the Draft Master Plan and urge you to defer action until more public meetings can be held on this.	Edit Proposed	Change document name as previously recommended and add a note in the executive summary Site Inventory and Suitability Assessment indicating that the SEPA process was not performed as part of the initial scope of work, and further environmental assessments will still be required for the implementation of projects recommended by the framework

<p>Patrice Tullai</p>	<p>1. Outreach to the public for the Master Plan process has been limited. The residents of the county have had very little opportunity for meaningful input. The 200-page Draft Master Plan and Appendices came out on March 1; the formal public comment period ends on March 18th. It has taken park planners and consultants more than ten years to draft this plan. Although residents of Kitsap County have had piece-meal input on specific issues over the years, they deserve an adequate period to access, evaluate, and make comment on this master park plan. Now that COVID is receding, there should be community meetings to discuss this plan, before it is officially adopted.</p> <p>8. The purpose of the Sound to Olympics Trail running through the Park is not clear. The "trail" is considered part of the County's Non-motorized transportation system, and is actually under the purview of the Public Works Department. But if that is the case, it should be designed as an alternative to vehicle use to reduce CO2 emissions. It should be designed to take County residents to where we work or shop. The STO will run through Bainbridge Island and North Kitsap, and will provide little benefit to the central and south ends of the county. And finally, the STO will run through the middle of PGFHP straight up to the town of Port Gamble, owned by and being developed by Rayonier/Olympic Property Group (OPG).</p> <p>9. According to the Draft Master Plan, consultations with the Port Gamble S'klallam and Suquamish nations have not been completed. When will their input become part of this plan? When will the public be informed about the review of tribal legal counsel, advisors, and scientists on the plan for PGFHP?</p> <p>10. The Memorandum of Agreement between Kitsap County and OPG appears to create a conflict of interest in the ability of the County to represent the public interest of its citizens and to have adequate public review of this Draft Master Plan if it has already been decided that the Master Plan will be approved by April 30, 2022. It appears that OPG with the payment of \$75,000 has already determined major features of this Park.</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Below is what is in the FAQ. Recommend duplication of similar language here. The STO alignment through the Park was considered from the outset of the acquisition campaign in 2010. It was further memorialized with the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facility Plan in 2013. Both documents included expansive public outreach to Kitsap residents, community groups and organizations. Both Plans received nearly unanimous support at their adoptions. Since this time, the STO alignment has been acknowledged in acquisition documents, stewardship plans and feasibility studies. Kitsap has dedicated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the planning, design and eventual construction of the multi-million-dollar public investment.</p>
-----------------------	---	----------------------	--

<p>Jay Zischke</p>	<p>Found the organization of the document difficult to follow and somewhat “disjointed”</p> <p>Appreciate the acknowledgement of the publics’ desire to conserve habitat and minimize “development”</p> <p>It is a long term document given the decades of logging still to come. There should be a plan review periodically.</p> <p>If I understood the issue correctly – there are deed transfer conditions which require public access in perpetuity, yet there may be recommended land classification designations (sensitive habitat areas) which in some way violate that requirement. An option to consider might be to restrict/prohibit pets/dogs in such sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p>With the epidemic driven pulse of people getting outside into Parks and natural spaces – there is a risk of compromising habitat value by accommodating too many human visitors. A future effort should be made to consider a target “carrying capacity” to ensure ecological health as well as visitor enjoyment. This should be an objective for all KC Heritage Parks.</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Recommend adding language that recommends the framework be reevaluated with each phase of proposed projects. No further edits recommended.</p>
<p>John Willett</p>	<p>I feel this survey is weighted heavily to development and not what historically it has been and the way it has been used.</p> <p>Which has been; horse, Walker, biker, hiker friendly. Adding ADU compliant trails. Ride park has been approved by user groups committee. Historically events were staged at the airport. The survey does not capture other alternatives that do not weight heavily to more development of the park than historic or approved uses today.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edit recommended</p>

<p>Edie Lau</p>	<p>1. Throughout the document, it's stated that harvesting will continue through 2042. It would be helpful for the public to know that harvest isn't a foregone conclusion, because efforts are underway to raise funds to buy timber rights in order to preserve mature trees. I realize that if the trees are harvested as planned, the forest will be replanted, but as I'm sure you're all aware, mature trees sequester much more carbon than young ones. Saving mature trees throughout Kitsap should be a high priority, especially so in parks.</p> <p>I believe I saw a reference in the document to the effort to buy the timber rights, but it is not a prominent reference and easily overlooked. I respectfully suggest adding it to the summary/preamble text on the website.</p> <p>2. The Draft Master Plan itself is difficult to read, owing to difficulty navigating the four-page layout. I read the executive summary, but when I tried to read some later sections, my computer (which is less than a year old with an M1 chip that is supposed to process quickly) started producing the spinning beach ball of death. Can the final plan be formatted such that it shows one page at a time? I also wonder if it needs to be as lengthy as it is. As a long-time reader of government documents, I suspect there is a lot of repetition.</p> <p>4. In the preamble text on the website, there's a reference to 8,000 acres acquired from Rayonier and "remaining 3,500" acres. I understand that the 3,500 acres are the park. What are the other 4,500 acres?</p> <p>5. Lastly, also in the preamble text, I suggest reconsidering the term "pioneers" in the sentence "Pioneers arrived in the 1850s to farm and log the area." Especially because the preceding paragraph references indigenous peoples' presence in the area, a better term might be "white settlers" or "settlers from the East," assuming either of those descriptors is accurate.</p> <p>That same paragraph reads, "A nearby sawmill was founded in 1853, with a historic company town built around the sawmill ..." The company town was not historic at the time. It became so only over time. I suggest deleting the word "historic" or putting it this way: "A sawmill was established in 1853, around which a company town was built — known today as the historic town of Port Gamble."</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>1. Recommend repeating note about ongoing efforts within executive summary 2. Noted, no edit recommended. Recommend considering how the document will be presented online once finalized 4. No edit recommended on document. Recommend editing online content once transferred to County-hosted site 5. Agree with both recommendations, recommend using the term "European settlers"</p>
<p>Elisa Rogers</p>	<p>1. In the meeting one of the presenters said the park will soon be part of a long-distance bike trail. To accommodate the increase in bike traffic, are there plans to make the roads around the park safer for cyclists?</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>No edits recommended. Recommend including Summary of plans for STO in FAQ and linking to Public</p>

	<p>2. Does anyone know what Rayonier's plans are for logging the parcels of land west of the private residences along Port Gamble Rd? (Which parcels will be harvested, and when?)</p>		<p>Works Site from County-hosted project site</p>
<p>Steve Ruggiero</p>	<p>As a long time Kitsap County resident I am a multi day per week user of Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park for walks, trail runs, mountain biking and mushroom picking - it's a jewel in our community and my entire family uses it for these activities. We enjoy it's proximity, peacefulness and the large amount of acreage to enjoy these multi use trails. We're very satisfied with the way that the park is being run, none too thrilled with the scope of the ongoing logging but recognize that as the trade off to keep this asset available to all stakeholders. No matter how crowded a trailhead may appear there is ample opportunity to find solitude or interact with a variety of users plugging in to nature. Any and every day.</p> <p>I noticed a group from Kitsap Environmental Coalition at the Bay View trailhead who were selectively approaching users and handing out talking points that they wanted to promote. With the thousands of volunteer hours, years of study, deliberation and public comment that have been contributed to the Park to get to this stage I was curious what their agenda was and why now.</p> <p>A review of their facebook site and website goals include several leading statements presented as fact that don't balance with my overall experiences here. All projects in this park are subject to Kitsap County review and approval and I find it disingenous to hint at park ecology issues as their handout highlighted and website suggests. Their implication that money made in Kitsap needs to stay in Kitsap suggests it is going elsewhere. It ignores the economic benefit that park users bring to surrounding communities - which are located in Kitsap. Easily their most egregious statement is that mountain biking is dangerous to all users and this park is solely devoted to them. These are multi use trails and there are multiple activities on them daily.</p> <p>I wanted to share my observations and experiences to balance out their narrow point of view. I would like to end with a compliment to all that have gotten the park to this stage and implore you to keep up the good work ensuring that it remains a place of relaxation, recreation, solitude and nature for all users.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended</p>

<p>Joseph Lubischer</p>	<p>1. The PGFHP plan's use of multiple terms (Landscape Classification, Land Use Table, Land Use Zone, Land Use Classification, Land Use Sub Classification, and Landscape Sub Classification) is most confusing! Simplification is called for. The plan should use the Landscape Classification term as previously defined by Parks and avoid conflicts with existing documents. The use of Land Use Classification for park types is not part of the Landscape Classification system (as stated p106) and is better clarified with a more meaningful term such as Park Type Classification. The terms Land Use Sub Classification and Landscape Sub Classification should not be used.</p> <p>2. Wetland mapping for PGFHP is clearly inadequate. Mapping of wetland buffers is entirely absent. The master plan (p 60) does not address these obvious problems. At the very least, the master plan must acknowledge these deficiencies, as well as the resultant limitations placed on defining landscape classifications and planning land use.</p> <p>3. The question was raised whether there was adequate public process for the PGFHP master plan. Regardless of Parks' intentions or efforts, it is fair to ask the question "Was the public process meaningful and effective?"</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>1. Simplify language throughout document where it makes sense. Consider defining each term when needed and first introduced in the document, or consider a glossary as part of appendices.</p> <p>2. Wetland mapping should have a note describing why buffers are not included and reference the same language used to indicate the distance unless otherwise dictated by local or state requirements.</p> <p>3. Noted, no edits recommended</p>
	<p>Review of Tribal references in document (David's Comment)</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Recommend changing any reference of "Native American", "the Tribes" or "Tribes" generically, change to "local Indigenous Tribes". All use of words should be capitalized.</p>

Summary and Introduction Sections			
Caroline Perisho	<p>Please consider adding language regarding the significant contribution that the North Kitsap Trails Association (NKTA) has made with years of volunteer hours spent writing the Concept Masterplan "String of Pearls" in 2012 that was adopted by the County.</p> <p>Please also acknowledge the generous and unparalleled contribution that Pope Resources (former owner of the property) made towards PGHFP.</p> <p>Please Complete the STO and make Kitsap County part of a bigger legacy.</p>	Edit Proposed	Acknowledge within history summary
Kim Greenwood	<p>Introduction and Planning Context, Terminology, Land Characteristics: There was a comment during the March 14th PGFHP stewardship meeting that there was inadequate recognition of the park history, specifically the partnerships involved to save the land. I disagree with that comment. I think the Introduction and Planning Context pages weaves in the history in several sections with plenty of detail without any grandstanding.</p> <p>Relevant documents - There was a comment made at the Parks Advisory Board meeting on March 16th that there wasn't enough explanation of the timber harvest agreement for the public. I think the master plan explains this pretty well in this section.</p>	Edit Proposed	Include summary of history in intro/planning context.

<p>Linda Berry-Maraist</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A unique collaborative partnership of extremely diverse interests worked together for an entire decade to create this park. The collaborative spirit of that public-private-community partnership and trust that diverse interests can work through challenges together, is at the heart of this park's existence. This should also mention the Kitsap Forest and Bay process that recommended including another timber rotation to decrease acquisition costs, and to maximize the land preserved for forever. That background and the acquisition process should be included on pg 1. • The ten-year partnership with Pope Resources/Rayonier, and Pope/Rayonier's willingness to accept a timber deed on ¾ of the park when the County could not afford to buy as much land as they wanted, was remarkable. A timber deed on ¾+ of the park is why we have a vast park and needs to be said clearly up front. Discussions about agreements regarding decommissioning logging roads, replanting and options to purchase more trees need to be stated more clearly and not be hidden so deep in the plan. • Using the 2015 maps AND eliminating the 2015 exemption for restrictions on trail corridors, combined with the new use restrictions in pages 108-115 would restrict mountain bikes, horseback riders, dog walkers and events from using ~ ½ the park (conservation areas)? Is this an error? • The conclusions in the plan say our community doesn't support tourism. Pg 78 appendices show that 56% of people said the purpose of the park was both community and tourism use. Is there data to support the conclusion opposing tourism? • The plan repeatedly states the park needs funding sources to operate but doesn't work through initial challenges enough to provide any direction or potential solutions. Coming up with well thought out solutions and considering both pros and cons of different actions (especially the risk of not coming up with financial solutions!) is important. • The possibility of grant-funded small guest cabins to provide ongoing revenue for the park didn't appear to be clearly considered. There was a conclusion to not pursue KPF D grant ideas because "there was almost no community support for that intense level of recreational development" (pg 6). But pg 91 shows that of just the people who gave input on the 3 alternatives, 35% preferred more park facilities, 42% preferred less facilities and 22% were in the middle. Appendices pg 30 survey results showed: "When asked to compare user fees for all park visitors to revenue generating facilities at the park, meeting participants were fairly evenly split (48% to 47% preference)." This subject needs more consideration before a decision is made to reject further KPF D funding. • "Active Recreation" needs to be defined. It was one of the nine key goals, but the plan recommends it be limited to a small area of the park (pg 9). Trail use should be clearly allowed and not be mixed up w/ "Active Recreation". 	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Include summary of history in intro/planning context. Regarding restrictions on trails, recommend reviewing language throughout for consistency. Define Active recreation as well as other classifications to avoid confusion with other documents. All other comments are noted, with no edits recommended.</p>
----------------------------	---	----------------------	---

<p>Linda Berry-Maraist</p>	<p>Pg 1: Executive Summary Introduction should include "Background & Acquisition Process", my suggestion:</p> <p>Pope Resources allowed public access on all of its timberlands and over decades the Port Gamble logging roads and trails built by the community had become very popular with the community. In 2007, Pope Resources/OPG held a community meeting and announced (due to increasing urbanization and distance to mills), long term plans to exit commercial timber operations in Kitsap County. The company asked if there was community interest in working towards a vision of public open space and trails connecting north Kitsap communities</p> <p>Over 500 people showed up at OPG's 2007 community meeting and created a groundswell of grass roots community energy. From the get-go, the land conservation project was rooted in collaborative partnerships between the landowner (Pope Resources/OPG), the community and local government. The groundswell of community support also created a unique and long-lasting collaboration between diverse community members and a wide range of organizations, all with different interests but united around the vision to "Save the land and trails!" Some people were primarily interested in active recreation and others watching birds, but everyone cared about conserving the land for future generations and wanted to be able get outside and enjoy the trails. There was an oft-repeated belief that if we were successful at saving this vast area of land for the public, there would be room for everyone's interests.</p> <p>The North Kitsap Trails Association grew out of the 2007 groundswell of community support and energy about the "String of Pearls" vision of linking our communities by trails and open space. In 2008 and 2009, NKTA obtained National Park Service grant support to create a North Kitsap trail plan and embarked on a multi-year community outreach effort. After 3 years, 27 public meetings and surveys of over 800 people, NKTA crafted the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan, which was officially adopted into the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan in 2011. The top priorities from that community process were obtaining access for the Sound to Olympics Trail and saving as much of OPG's Port Gamble land as possible.</p> <p>In 2010, a coalition of community organizations and individuals, with guidance from Great Peninsula Conservancy, created the Kitsap Forest & Bay Project. That unique partnership with Kitsap County, the Port Gamble/S'Klallam and Suquamish Tribes, Pope Resources, Forterra, Great Peninsula Conservancy and 33 community organizations raised over \$17,000,000 which led to the acquisition of multiple properties in North Kitsap, including land that is now the Park.</p> <p>The collaborative partnership between the landowner, community, County and Tribes extended for over a decade from the 2007 start. For ten years Pope Resources/OPG put off harvesting trees and gave this community the chance to obtain one of the largest County parks anywhere, and for ten years the County, government leaders, community members and multiple organizations kept working at acquiring the land. And when it was clear that time,</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Recommend reviewing with County and Steering Committee for use.</p>
----------------------------	---	----------------------	--

	<p>money and grant sources were running out, there were very hard discussions and hard choices.</p> <p>In 2013 the Kitsap Forest and Bay community group came to a consensus to focus on future generations and prioritize conserving a larger area of land instead of protecting both land and trees. A statement was vetted and unanimously agreed to by KFB community members including Kitsap Audubon, North Kitsap Trails Association, Ride Kitsap (mountain biking group) and the Great Peninsula Conservancy, it was then forwarded to the Kitsap Forest and Bay leadership. It stated:</p> <p>“In order to further the goal of preserving the 7,000 acres of the Kitsap Forest and Bay Project for the public forever, we encourage the KFBP Principals to explore the idea of allowing Pope Resources (or its successor) an additional timber harvest rotation to decrease land acquisition costs, while replanting a mix of native species and transitioning to a sustainably managed forest.”</p> <p>At the end of 2017, after a final fundraising push which included 1,200 community members writing checks, 3,435 park acres were owned by Kitsap County. Of the 3,435 acres, Pope Resources carried a timber deed on 2,723 acres or 79% of the acreage. That private-public-community partnership and Pope Resources willingness to carry a timber deed is why we have such a large park. It is also why we have the challenges of commercial timber harvest within a public park.</p> <p>This master plan is a continuation of the significant and collaborative work done by each of those partners and the community.</p>		
--	---	--	--

<p>Linda Berry-Maraist</p>	<p>The Landscape paragraph 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add: After many years of effort and fundraising, Kitsap County was not able to afford to buy both the land and trees and decided to prioritize long-run land conservation over saving trees. In a series of 2016 and 2017 transactions, Kitsap County acquired 2,723 additional acres, while Pope Resources (now Rayonier) retained the timber rights to make one more harvest over 25 years. • Pg 2: On blocks of land acreage add note that County owns land & trees in 712 acres of shoreline and Ride Park blocks, but in the 2,723 acres of the east and west forest blocks, the County owns the land, but Rayonier has a 25-year timber deed. <p>Community Preferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 6 "...a majority of the public meeting participants indicated a willingness to pay dedicated taxes and fees rather than rely heavily on attracting tourists." <p>Funding: this plan repeatedly discusses the risk of the park if adequate and reliable funding isn't available (pg 1 and elsewhere) but no clear proposal is made for how to fund the park. Evaluation of economic development issues and affordability do not seem to have considered the possibility of grant funded visitor facilities like small cabins that could produce long term revenue for the park.</p> <p>Pg 5 & 77 Economic Development: Conclusion that there is virtually no benefit from tourism is surprising. The statement that 1,000 parties staying overnight only generate \$75,000 in local revenue and \$8,500 in local tax revenue doesn't mesh with 2015 study estimating that Kitsap County tourism resulted in \$30,100,000 in state and local tax receipts. Why are the tourism revenue estimates in this report so much lower than the 2015 study and state and national studies on tourism revenues?</p> <p>"Active Recreation" is not defined and is treated very inconsistently</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Venues for Active Recreation was shown as one of 9 key goals after the initial public meetings. (Pg 9, 50, 51). In public meeting #1 the top priorities were hiking, biking, disc-golf, mountain biking and walking. (pg 56) • But the plan concludes that only a small portion of this park is suitable for active recreational use other than trails (pg 6) and states active recreation will be limited to a small area of the park. Since all of the grants and fundraising for this park emphasized trail use, "active recreation" should be clearly defined as not being trails or trail events. The Master Plan should be clear that trail use is a priorit 	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Regarding added language to The Landscape, review with County and Steering Committee for edit.</p> <p>Community Preferences: Noted comment on Page 6, no edits recommended.</p> <p>Recommend description of economic evaluation process in document, could be appendix, no edits to estimates are recommended.</p> <p>Other comments noted, no edits recommended</p>
----------------------------	--	----------------------	---

<p>Linda Berry-Maraist</p>	<p>2015 Map & Land Use Recommendations and restrictions: (pg 10) Why are far more extensive restrictions recommended for this park than other large County parks? Pg 27: Table of contents should be at beginning of document There are conflicting statements within the Plan on how the community feels about tourism. The wording in the plan concludes that the community doesn't support tourism but the questionnaire in the appendices doesn't show that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the appendices pg 78, the majority (56%) of respondents said the primary purpose of the park was both local use and tourism. <p>Appendices pg 78 question 12: What is the primary purpose of the park? Local Use Tourism Both local use and Tourism 164 (42%) 6 (2%) 218 (56%)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 6 concludes "the ambitious development plans included in the KPF D grants were not included as alternatives as there was almost no community support for that intense level of recreation development. • Pg 84: "There are conflicting opinions about encouraging tourism as well as impacts of certain uses on the resource. " The public has concerns regarding the economic, ecological and social impacts of tourism..." Where is the data for our community objecting to tourism? Park Recommendations pg 11 & 118-121. There is extensive discussion on decommissioning logging roads but the majority of the park has a 25-year timber deed. Logging roads can't be decommissioned while logging is ongoing. <p>Maps (pg 12,13) should show 3 future trailhead parking locations per NK MOU w/ Rayonier. Pg 14 parking: 12 parking stalls at Stottelmeyer seems inadequate. Where will trail event and overflow parking be? (Stottelmeyer 30/60 had nearly 500 participants some years) Pg 17: Since the County harvests trees in parks to cover the costs of the County forester, hiring a 2nd forester would increase cutting trees w/in parks. Is the trade-off worth it? Map pg 18 & 171 shows the north portion of the Ride Park as having the highest conservation priority. What was the data that generated the conclusions shown in this map? Pg 31: Kitsap County was the lead agency and worked directly w/ Forterra on fundraising.</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Recommend moving Table of Contents to front of Executive Summary due to size of section. If final pdf can also be labelled by section for navigation, this could help. Recommend clarifying that recommendations to decommission logging roads would be after their use for timber harvesting are no longer needed. Recommend including in document a description of methodology used for mapping, could be in appendices. County agrees with revision on pg. 31. All other comments noted, no further edits recommended.</p>
----------------------------	---	----------------------	--

<p>Doug Maraist</p>	<p>Overall, I really like the built-environment development planning at the north & south end in the masterplan, which will leave the vast majority of the park as public open-space for a more natural forest to grow after Rayonier's final tree harvest. Please address my follow questions/comments:</p> <p>1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Provide additional historic wording/context to acknowledge the incredible contribution that the former landowner (Pope Resources) played by giving the County & their stakeholders +/- 30 time-extensions while holding off tree harvest for more than 10 years. This was THE main reason along with the perseverance of the community partners, that we were able to conserve the final amount of land in the park, but the Master plan seem silent on this very important issue!</p> <p>2. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Provide additional historic wording/context to acknowledge contribution that the North Kitsap Trails Association (NKTA), funded with community donations, National Park Service grant and thousands of volunteer hours spent creating the Concept Masterplan from 2009-2011. NKTA hosted several public planning meetings with dozens of community user groups & citizens along with almost 3-dozen outreach events with public/private local organization and governmental committees. Kitsap County adopted this community-lead planning document called the "String of Pearls" into their Comprehensive Plan in 2011. Once again, this new Masterplan is silent on this very important community-lead detail as to why this park is as large as it is today.</p> <p>3. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Provide additional historic wording/context to acknowledge that Pope/Rayonier still carries a timber deed on almost 80% of the 3,500 acres. This was another main reason that we were able to conserve the final amount of land in the park, but the Master plan seem silent on this very important issue!</p> <p>4. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Provide additional wording/context to acknowledge that according to this public meeting process, 56% of the respondents stated that their primary purpose of the park was for local and tourism use (Appendices pg. 78 question 12). It is unclear why conflicting information in this Masterplan (pg. 6 & 84) that the public "...has concerns regarding the economic, ecological and social impacts of tourism...". It seems that the majority of respondents want "eco-tourism" in Kitsap, but the ambiguous wording elsewhere in the Masterplan alludes to something else. It is very important that this Park play a role in making Kitsap a more sustainable place for the next generation to live and work locally, in which eco-tourism is another option for local employment.</p> <p>5. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Provide additional wording/context to acknowledge on ES-18 LAND CONSERVATION & RESTORATION, that the public understands that the "standard" forestry practices are within the purchase agreement(s) and that the proposed uses of the land for education or tree purchases proposes changes to the harvest of the trees, the forestry practices agreement will need to be revised.</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>1-3: Include summary of history 4: Noted, no edit recommended 5: Noted, no edit recommended (this will be covered by COHP) 6: Define as previously stated 7: Noted, no edit recommended as there is only one mention of this</p>
---------------------	--	----------------------	---

	<p>6. INTRODUCTION: Provide a specific definition of what "Active Recreation" means in this Masterplan. History in various Kitsap Parks has proven in past & current events that the "stewards" will create their own definition of that term and outlaw various types of use, as what happened at the Hansville Greenway Park in 2011 (outlawing local high school cross-county running events) and is currently happening at North Kitsap Heritage Park trying to outlaw the Sound to Olympics trail. Most of these PUBLIC spaces were purchased with recreation money.</p> <p>7. INTRODUCTION: Provide a specific definition of what "Community Resiliency" means in this Masterplan, for it is listed as the "purpose" of the park and it is used redundantly in the document. It is unclear as to how this term is our "purpose". The community's purpose was to buy as much land as possible. This term is very ambiguous and it means something different to the various user groups.</p>		
--	--	--	--

Planning Context Section			
Linda Berry-Maraist	<p>Pg 35 History-refer to comments re Background and Acquisition. Kitsap County did not own the Divide ROW in 2017 but GPC purchased the Grover's Creek portion of the Divide much earlier.</p> <p>Pg 37: last paragraph on FPA is good. This info should be summarized at the beginning of the document so that the public understand the agreements are for standard re-planting practice.</p> <p>Pg 38: Kitsap County adopted the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan into the County Comprehensive Plan in 2011. The top priorities of that plan were the STO and Port Gamble open space/trails.</p> <p>Pg 39: I attended every public meeting and don't believe this statement is accurate: "... the community strongly expressed preference that most of the park be managed as an environmental versus recreational resource," Where is that data?</p> <p>Pg 41: The NKTA String of Pearls Trail plan was adopted by the County in 2011. In 2013 the County adopted the non-motorized facilities plan and included the STO and NKTA trail plan in the non-motorized plan.</p> <p>Pg 42: road to Ride Park will allow access through Babcock farm (future, not past tense). Road will be built in 2023.</p>	Edit Proposed	<p>p.35: Recommend review of history with County and Steering Committee</p> <p>p.37: Verify and consider note on page ES-2. (Verify that this is accurate, as there's been another mention of replanting options, clarify if that's the case)</p> <p>p.38 and p.41: Reference document once where applicable</p> <p>p.39: Noted, no edit recommended</p> <p>p.42: correct "through" Babcock farm, otherwise statement appears fine.</p>
Jay Zischke	<p>Pg 37 - Relevant documents, plan & policies Last paragraph pg 37 recommends adding the PGFHP & STO trail plan into the State's recreational plan (to be updated in 2022). Recommend adding in other Kitsap County Heritage Parks at that time as well.</p> <p>Pg 38 - County land use and zoning tables - the last two sentences of this paragraph should be reviewed and clarified. This may be referencing the issue of land use designation which prohibits public use (inconsistent with deeds?)</p> <p>Pg 39 - Restrictions per third party agreement - the 4th bullet here references obligations regarding the western block – HCP and annual monitoring - I did not find a plan for meeting this obligation in the master plan?</p>	Comment Noted	All comments noted, no edits recommended for this specific document

Master Planning Process Section			
Doug Maraist	<p>In Part 3 - MASTER PLANNING PROCESS (pg 91), you state "A majority..." of the questionnaire responses preferred the least developed Alternate 'A' (at 42% of responses), that is actually not accurate. Majority of the respondents preferred Alternative "B & C" (at 58%). Please use the correct percentages at: Alternative A @ 42%, Alternative B @ 35% & Alternative C @ 23% in lieu of that stated.</p> <p>I do like how the Masterplan has now created a phased development approach for the "built-environment" of the park's planning.</p>	Edit Proposed	Change "majority"
Doug Maraist	<p>In Part 3 - MASTER PLANNING PROCESS – Review (pg 91), you state "There was little support for a disc golf course at the north end so that was eliminated from the site plan." This is an unfair statement, for never were the rules of the Masterplan's public meeting ever stated that if you did NOT respond to the questionnaire, your voice would NOT be heard! Quite the contrary, at the Masterplan's 1st public meeting, the Disc Golf community was well in attendance and was very vocal at their desire to be inclusive in the Park's user groups. Also, in 2011-2012 during the Conceptual Masterplan public meetings, the Disc Golf community was well represented as a user group. It seems rather unfair that in the 3,500-acre Park, a half-dozen acres could not be designated in the drawings for this user group. I urge you NOT to eliminate them from the Masterplan design drawings because most of this "youth-oriented" user group were back in school and could not attend the later public meeting past Summer 2021.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Linda Berry-Maraist	<p>Pg 79: Many people walk dogs in the park. Access: add future parking areas.</p> <p>Pg 85: Community priorities. Data should be provided as to the community opposition to active recreation and KPF D grant alternatives.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Jay Zischke	<p>Pg 60 - Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA's) - both the map and text describe a significant percent of PGFHP categorized as CARA 2. Given the acreage of this, and other Heritage Parks in Kitsap County I wonder if the Public Utility District was consulted regarding the benefits of long term protection of these recharge areas?</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended

Master Plan Overview Section

<p>Reed Blanchard</p>	<p>1. We need more time to review. This is a really large document and I only found the link to it two weeks ago just before the public meeting on 3/7. An additional two to four weeks would be sufficient.</p> <p>2. For my initial look, it appears that the SEPA process may be what I understand to be 'piece meal'. I do utility work as a profession, and I am required to complete the SEPA process with an understanding that all aspects of the project will be incorporated at once - so that the effect of the change is fully captured. I don't think the SEPA process for the Park is correct. This is a big concern for me.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended.</p> <p>As a guidance document, the Framework does not direct future action nor does it act as a step in any approval process, permit, policy or otherwise. Future efforts towards the recreational and education components for the Framework will require planning level SEPA review once incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan, Parks Recreation and Open Space plan or similar document. The Park projects that predated the beginning of Framework development had previously received planning-level SEPA review. The Mountain Biking Ride Park and Stottlemeyer Trailhead are allowed uses in the Parks zone and their potential impacts (at a planning level) were determined when they received this zoning. The Sound to Olympics Trail (STO) was considered with the adoption of the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Non-Motorized Facility Plan in</p>
---------------------------	--	--------------------------	---

			2013. Again, these impacts were assessed at a planning level. Additional project-level SEPA review is required when project permits are submitted. This level of review covers specific traffic and other impacts based on known trip generation and other metrics. Such permits are currently in review for the Mountain Biking Ride Park and Stottlemeyer Trailhead and will be required for construction of the STO segments in the future.
E. Rogers	Hello! I live on Port Gamble Rd NE. My property borders the strip of Rayonier land along the southeastern part of the park. Would you be able to tell me what the plan is for that Rayonier land over the coming years/decades? ANYTHING you might know or any insights you can share would be much appreciated. I asked this question twice during last week's public meeting #4 but nobody addressed it. Please reply -- I'd be very grateful for any information you might be able to offer! Thank you so much!	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended.

<p>Marion Allen</p>	<p>I am 65 and have lived in Kitsap County for almost 35 years, where my daughter attended public school then went on to graduate from UW. I was born in Oregon and have also lived for periods of time in Idaho and in Leavenworth, Washington. I am a microbiologist, but wildlife and the outdoors have been my passion. My first backpack on the pacific crest trail was at the age of 16. I am happy to now call Poulsbo my home.</p> <p>I have been hiking in the Pt.Gamble trails for almost 10 years. Currently, I am there at least twice a week. I have probably been on a good many of the trails and am so thankful for them. I have been following and participated in some of the community forums for the comprehensive plan. I , and many many others, feel that saving this precious area for wildlife and wildlife habitat, as well as having a place for those of us that live in Kitsap county to go to be out in the forest should be the primary goal. To be clear, I have seen many "multi use plans" in my life.</p> <p>I know the Rayonier company has eyes on making big dollars out of its investment in Port Gamble and the forest, and this is where I say STOP! Here are the points I would like you to consider:</p> <p>1 Paving the part of the trail for STO handicap access- First, I wonder if anyone in a wheelchair has actually assessed the trail for ease of use. I have hiked that part of the trail and seen young, strong bikers huffing and puffing their way up. I can't imagine someone in a wheelchair doing it. There is also the point that paving a trail is one of the worst things to do for wildlife and water flow. After about the first mile of the beginning, the trail becomes a logging road, which seems like it would be fine for a wheelchair. Please, reconsider the paving of trails.</p> <p>2 Glamping/camping!/? Really!??? Who is that going to benefit? I understand there is to be a big hotel built in Port Gamble. This glamping idea is only an attraction for Rayonier to lure people to their business. I feel like this is only asking for trouble. Has anyone considered the big possibility of anyone Glamping starting a nice forest fire? The area has already been shut down the last 2 or 3 summers because of fire danger and this isn't going to get any better.</p> <p>3 I realize most of the higher development area is in the end near Port Gamble. This area is already quite busy, especially in the spring/summer/fall time of year. With increased use due to all of this recreation activity, current infrastructure will not support this. Will this cost go to the county or will Rayonier be asked to take on the responsibility?</p> <p>4 It is clear that the alternate plan of less development is a much better plan. I feel like the master plan partnership listened much harder to what Rayonier preferred than to what the people of kitsap county could and would actually support.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended.</p> <p>The Park was acquired for all residents and visitors to Kitsap. While not all of the Park will be accessible to all people, the Framework includes opportunities for those differently-abled or those with physical limitations. Soft-surfaces (e.g. gravel and dirt) create impediments for wheelchairs (powered or manual), canes, walkers and other mobility aids can struggle with these surfaces especially it times of rainfall common in the Pacific Northwest. The paved surface allows for a safe and stable means for all visitors to experience the beauty of portions of the Park. Smaller parking lots and trail heads are proposed around the periphery of the Park allow for access to different Park sections for use by multiple audiences with differing capabilities.</p>
---------------------	---	----------------------	---

<p>Carol Price</p>	<p>I have been walking in this park 2-3 times a week for some years now. My concern is that this park will become a huge urban thoroughfare what with the STO and the developments in the north end; the company owned town of Pt. Gamble clearly plans on taking advantage. My general comment is "less development in Pt Gamble Park is better". Please!</p> <p>At the end of the survey, I chose not to answer #16 about planting trees and plants originally native to the park, or introducing other plants that may do better as the climate changes. Well, I don't have the expertise to answer such a question. Things are so complicated now. I assume that you and the stewards will be consulting with Arno Bergstrom and those that have the background to make such decisions.</p> <p>The trails system seems to be dedicated primarily for the mountain biking crowd. Why? Aren't the majority of users walking? On the weekends it already gets congested with bikers. Right now during this rainy season, dirt trails like Ewok are being reduced to mud and puddles because of tire traffic. After development, between the STO, the many logging roads, and the Ride Park, bikes will be everywhere. Where will the wildlife find sanctuary? Will there be any wildlife left? Why not have most of the dirt paths be dedicated to walking? Quiet places, meditative spaces are so rare anymore..... Walking through deep forest and in nature is healing--in Japanese, shinrin-yoku, or forest bathing.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended</p>
--------------------	---	----------------------	------------------------------------

<p>John Willett</p>	<p>David,</p> <p>I did take those surveys at the meetings. I didn't think, from what I knew (I have a lot on my plate right now), that Alternatives were ready to be presented. The Alternatives 1,2 and 3 that now are being presented seem top heavy with Development?</p> <p>Parking for all users groups will be a big deal, especially for horse trailers. We need to figure out water access for small craft. The Park's high banks are a problem. This might be in OPG's court with the old Mill Site? Right now, OPG has no access in their plans that I can see?</p> <p>Also, having a big area in the Park for events (the old airfield owned by OPG was a great place) should be a priority. When the Plan refers to Event Center, what does that mean? I know you are working hard trying to figure out a Plan for the Park gleaned from a very diverse group of Users with complicated agendas. Ain't easy!</p> <p>My biggest concern, as most know, is fire and rescue. Not only will there be lots of need in the Park, but the new town will be underserved and over the time limits for response both in the town and in the Park. I have not heard that my push for a new fire hall in Port Gamble has gotten any traction, yet? I have talked with the Fire Chief in the district (Gillard) and he is supportive of a new fire hall in PG. I really believe that the Park plan should address this critical issue of lack of timely service and adequate infrastructure for fire and rescue on that Port Gamble Peninsula.</p> <p>By the way; I have asked the Commissioners office to start looking for a Planning Company to complete the STO North Plan from Kingston to the Park. F/B should take the lead, in my view</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended other than consider clarifying on page 120 that class 4 trails will be used for maintenance and emergency vehicle access.</p>
<p>Kim Greenwood</p>	<p>Master Planning Process, Master Plan overview: I am concerned about any potential for spread of active recreation. A comment at the March 14th stewardship meeting asked that active recreation be defined. I agree with that. I think of active recreation as anything that requires some sort of development, such as specialized trails (like in the ride park and STO), amphitheater, camping, forest tree top course, etc - essentially anything that's not an old logging road or a footpath (that obviously is used by bikes and horses as well as pedestrians). Therefore, promises that development will be limited to the area near the ride park are important to me. Maybe some restrictive, limiting boundaries need to be put into place now?</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Define as previously stated</p>

Park Recommendations Section

John Williams

I didn't see any discussion of the benefits of Class 1 and Class 2 trails. As a matter of fact, I didn't see any cohesive discussion of the pros and cons leading to the draft plans for trails, to the placement of trails, or to the exclusion of types 1 and 2. I think that a summary of pros and cons for these things would be helpful in the plan.

I think that the following ought to be reflected in the plan and should lead to plans for more Class 1 or 2 trails:
 Pedestrians typically walk much shorter distances than are covered by bicyclists or horse riders. Therefore, when considering trail loops, it is important that there be shortcuts for pedestrians so that they can access the largest portion of the park without unrealistic walking distances.

Pedestrians can also tolerate less improved trails than are required for bicycles and horses. The trail treads can be generally unimproved with light forest duff and even fallen logs crossing them. For me and many others, these don't detract from the viability of the trail, rather they help keep my foot-eye coordination in good practice and the softer tread is easier on my hips and knees. But such trails are not recommended for bicycle or horses. For example, there is a primitive trail covered by forest duff that I have walked many times without difficulty, but one day I saw that a horse had been there and its hooves had punched holes in the duff and even broken through some of the rotting logs that were on the trail, something that was probably dangerous for the horse.

Furthermore, these trails are far less expensive to build and maintain than Class 3 or greater trails. So with very little impact on the overall budget, they can be designed to allow pedestrian shortcuts and also access to areas whose ecosystems might suffer from the higher level of traffic seen by Class 3 or 4 trails (e.g. the pedestrian trails to the Beaver ponds).

One other consideration: I haven't seen any local, scientific data to support this, but my experience and conversations with other trail users leads me to believe that pedestrians and educational groups (rather than horse or bike riders) are more likely to be traveling slowly with the intention of examining the flora and fauna along the trail. And they are more likely to be interested in visiting unique environments, such as seasonal wetlands, and tolerant of seasonally accessible trails. The discontinued Yellow Jacket trail is an example of a trail which provided a useful shortcut for pedestrians as well as access to the kind of seasonal wetland and open area that is otherwise not accessible/visible in the park.

Edit Proposed

Include definitions and descriptions for each classification of trail in the Trails section, and consider supporting graphic. Consider language added to note that user accessibility is considered in trail planning. The Park was acquired for all residents and visitors to Kitsap. While not all of the Park will be accessible to all people, the Framework includes opportunities for those differently-abled or those with physical limitations. Soft-surfaces (e.g. gravel and dirt) create impediments for wheelchairs (powered or manual), canes, walkers and other mobility aids can struggle with these surfaces especially it times of rainfall common in the Pacific Northwest. The paved surface allows for a safe and stable means for all visitors to experience the beauty of portions of the Park. Smaller parking lots and trail heads are proposed around the periphery of the Park allow for access to different Park

			sections for use by multiple audiences with differing capabilities.
Gwenn Thomas	<p>The park has already turned into BMX Bike facility. Lots of vegetation has been removed, trails changed for Bike cycles with banked turns that make it nearly possible to hike.</p> <p>I hiked 100 miles in Jan 2022 in the Park and only saw one bird. The bikes scare the animals away. We have adjacent property to the park and we have 3 bucks and 5 does now since the logging and then bike development. The animals have left the park and are changing the our property and have eaten every fruit tree and blueberry bush. We have been here 30 years, this started 2 years ago.</p> <p>The Port Gamble Park property was bought to preserve the forest and have a place for animals and tranquility. This is not a private bike park. Further any plans for camping are out of character for a county park. Any camping will open it up to homeless encampment. The North End has almost no Sheriff presence, lots of thefts, car thefts, already to have homeless camps. Definite NO to camping at the park. Kitsap Memorial State park is 2 miles away and has a camp ground that is almost always empty</p> <p>Preserve Our Park, the trails and the tranquility. To many bikes as already with over 100 cars every weekend.This is Not a destination bicycle park.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Colleen Burke	<p>Hello I am deeply concerned about the proposed developments to Port Gamble Heritage Park. This park has been a refuge for me and my dog, especially during covid. It looks like the new developments will greatly favor mountain bikers at the expense of horseback riders and walkers. The great thing about this park is that it is for all different types. To give large portions exclusively for mountain bikers means could effect wildlife and endanger pedestrians. I feel there needs to be more input from the public on how this park is going to be developed and how the county is going to accommodate all these different aspects.</p>	Comment Noted	<p>Noted, no edits recommended.</p> <p>Recommend explaining STO and Ride Park approval with FAQ.</p> <p>The acquisition of the 3500-acre Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park (PGFHP) required years of dedication from multiple different community groups and interests. This included conservationists, hikers, bike and horseback riders and walkers. Each</p>

		<p>saw a wonderful opportunity for the community as a whole, but also for their specific interests. From the outset of the acquisition campaign in 2010, the Parks future showed opportunities for each interest to have a presence in the Park. This included a Mountain Bike Ride Park in the NW corner, a regional, paved, shared-use path (Sound to Olympics Trail) through the Park and trailheads to improve parking and access to the many areas including Stottlemeyer Road. All grant applications, agency negotiations, advocacy from local and state elected officials included the messaging of these specific opportunities if our acquisition was successful. Kitsap is dedicated to meeting these commitments to acknowledge the years of efforts of so many to make the Park possible. The STO alignment through the Park was considered from the outset of the acquisition campaign in 2010. It was further memorialized with</p>
--	--	--

			<p>the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facility Plan in 2013. Both documents included expansive public outreach to Kitsap residents, community groups and organizations. Both Plans received nearly unanimous support at their adoptions. Since this time, the STO alignment has been acknowledged in acquisition documents, stewardship plans and feasibility studies. Kitsap has dedicated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the planning, design and eventual construction of the multi-million-dollar public investment.</p>
Judy Willott	<p>I think there are some definition problems causing some concern. For example on page 108, it seems that horses (livestock) and pets(dog walkers) are prohibited in the conservation areas. Since there are trails allowed through that area, I can only assume that there is a definition problem with the wording, - livestock and pets. There may be other inadvertent conflicts in the uses allowed lists.</p>	Comment Noted	<p>Note for future trail and signage planning. Confirm consistency with restrictions. No edits recommended otherwise.</p>
Debbie Griffin	<p>It is rewarding to see the culmination of years of work and visioning by multiple organizations and individuals come together in this draft master plan.</p> <p>I was surprised to see the plan for 50 to 100 tent spaces proposed within the plan. I am not in favor of camping within the park except for the Bayview area to support the string of pearls water trail.</p> <p>I would be curious to see how the definition of 'active recreation" is being used in this document.</p>	Comment Noted	<p>Noted, no edits recommended other than removal of campground at shoreline.</p>

<p>Deborah Weinmann</p>	<p>Thank you for adding two Class 2 trails on the Proposed Trails Classifications Map.</p> <p>Based on the map, 0.2 miles of the Class 2 trail type have been added for the Beaver Pond Pedestrian Only (No pets) Trail and 0.4 miles for Ankle Biter (Pedestrian Only?). Doing the math $(0.0 + 0.6)/45=0.01$. The total milage for Class 1 (0 miles) and Class 2 (0.6 miles) represents 1% of all the proposed trail miles.</p> <p>On p. 78 of the Appendices Question 11, "11. Potential user conflicts on trails can best be avoided by: (Choose one)", the most popular answer was "Designating trails as single use trails". As such, I feel the survey results are not reflected in the Proposed Trail Classifications map, particularly for passive users.</p> <p>You might be surprised to know I mountain bike in the park. Yet, I see that far more trails will be biker only when considering the ride park area, the Ranger corridor, as well as trails such as Derailer, Bobsled, Downhell, and others throughout the park which from a practical standpoint would not be safe for multi-use.</p> <p>For this reason, I would encourage a democratic process within the PGFHP Stewardship trails sub-committee when determining final trail usage. I support both single-use and multi-use trails with usage being decided by an inclusive process which includes representation from all user groups and, most importantly, a focus on equity across user groups.</p> <p>Let's work together and look at the park experience from different user perspectives and then make good decisions reflecting fairness. Additionally, impacts to the environment and wildlife also deserve consideration (for example, the health of Port Gamble Bay).</p> <p>I do hope to get more involved in trail use discussions with the aim of harmony versus conflict.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted for future trail and sigange planning, no edits recommended</p>
-------------------------	--	----------------------	--

Andy Mangan	Please don't build a paved path through the spine of the park.	Comment Noted	<p>Noted, no edits recommended.</p> <p>Recommend explaining STO and Ride Park approval with FAQ.</p> <p>The STO alignment through the Park was considered from the outset of the acquisition campaign in 2010. It was further memorialized with the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facility Plan in 2013. Both documents included expansive public outreach to Kitsap residents, community groups and organizations. Both Plans received nearly unanimous support at their adoptions. Since this time, the STO alignment has been acknowledged in acquisition documents, stewardship plans and feasibility studies. Kitsap has dedicated hundreds of thousands of dollars to the planning, design and eventual construction of the multi-million-dollar public investment.</p>
Julia Smith	I am hearing that Kitsap county parks are planning on expanding the Port gamble trails to include camping and yurts? I have been walking those trails twice a week for years and don't look forward to them being ruined by development. They don't even own the parking lot at	Comment Noted	<p>Noted, no edits recommended</p>

	Stottie and Kitsap county parks don't even have enough money to maintain the parks they have. Where is the money coming from? This started out with volunteers and now it's getting too overdeveloped if the master plan is followed.		
Doug Lyons	I believe that we should periodically log alternate portions of the land in order not only fund the upkeep of that property but all the other parks we have.	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Carol Price	<p>This park provides abundant space and trails for walkers and nature admirers, and it is appreciated. PGF park stewards, all volunteers, are doing a commendable job maintaining the trails and parkland. Over the years I have seen barred owls, eagles, hawks, deer tracks, ruffed grouse, woodpeckers, frogs, chipmunks, and vistas of the Olympics and Cascade Mountains. Last year my brother spotted a cougar in the Uplands area. PGFHP has so much potential.</p> <p>There will be active clear cutting for the next 20+ years. Will the mature forest around the Springs area off 1100 be clear cut by Rayonier? Even with buffers around the streams and springs, clear cutting in this fragile area would be a travesty. The springs and beaver ponds area are all within one of the areas where the County owns the tree rights – this means Rayonier does not own these timber rights and will not harvest.</p> <p>Trails are multi-use and this is becoming a real problem. A survey by PGF planners found that the majority of users were on foot, and yet mountain bikers have access to all of the roads and dirt trails, with the exception of Tessa's and part of Beaver Pond. The 170 acre Ride Park, plus five other trails are all exclusively for bikers. And now we hear that e-bikes are going to be allowed. This 3,500 acre park is becoming a mountain biking mecca, crowding out the rest of us. If 60% of users are on foot or horseback, then 60% of the trails need to be exclusively for feet, paws, and hooves. Trails like Secret Squirrel, Springs, Beaver Pond, ET, Ewok, Wild West, Downhell, Ankle Biter, and others deserve to be tire free.</p> <p>The new signage on Ranger and Hood Trails are not in keeping with the usual low key</p>	Comment Noted	<p>Noted, no edits recommended.</p> <p>Recommend clarifying timber deeds and efforts to procure timber rights in FAQ.</p> <p>In acquiring large portions of the park, Kitsap County was limited in funding and only acquired the land to protect it from future development. The timber, more than 60% of the overall's property's value, was left with Rayonier to harvest one last time. They must conclude these harvests by 2042. As areas are harvested, Kitsap County takes full ownership and can begin restoration for natural mature forest. This does not apply to the Shoreline Block or the Ride Park which the County owns both land and timber. The Framework proposes to restore the vast majority of the park (93.3%) to long-term, natural, mature forests. The Framework</p>

county/state park signs
—they are “in your face”. Why is there a gate at the top of Ranger Trail? The gate and signs at the Ranger Corridor are in place for safety. Given the extreme nature of these trails it is important that users recognize them as ‘different’ from the rest of the trail system and treat them with caution. These physical barriers and signs help do to this.

The planning process for PGF has been opaque for years. The Master Planning Public Meetings and the survey have allowed for very limited input from residents.

The Sound to Olympics Trail (STO) and other park infrastructure will bring in many more users, especially bikers, lending weight to relegating dirt trails to feet, paws, and hooves. With the increased traffic on the STO and the Ride Park, won’t there be safety issues? This occurred in Seattle when the Burke Gillman and Green Lake Trails were built; they had to paint arrows on the asphalt directing traffic flow. The STO will impact the wild plants and animals, increasing temperatures, storm water runoff, and interrupting wildlife corridors. There are watershed concerns here also: culverts under logging roads that no longer have water flowing through; standing water in the huge clear cut Uplands area; lack of protection for the fragile springs off of 1100.

Saving these 3,500 acres as a park is admirable. However, exponentially increasing human recreation and development increases our responsibility to the plant life and the creatures that live there. We are the invasive species. Prioritizing interests around commerce and recreation at the expense of life is no longer viable.

proposes continued efforts to acquire timber stands from Rayonier between now and the conclusion of their timber rights (2042). Kitsap, conservation groups and community partners are currently working to raise money to preserve several key tree stands around wetlands and streams, the Sound to Olympics Trail alignment and other mature areas. This acquisition will require a combination of state and local funding as well as private fundraising to make it a reality. Many of the timbers stands in the Park need management to ensure their long-term health. Rayonier planted and managed many stands for commercial harvest. This growing strategy often plants trees close together, providing for little understory and limited wildlife habitat benefit. To ensure the long-term viability of these stands and protect them from disease, some selective harvesting is necessary over time. These harvests provide space for trees to grow fully and he

			expansion of ground vegetation. Such environmentally-sensitive thinnings are directed by the Kitsap County Forest Stewardship Plan which has been used successfully countywide.
Bill Agnew	I understand that today is the last day for comment on the PGFHP master plan. I'll be brief. I am a hiker but I have friends who are mountain bikers and friends who are riders. I have just recently become somewhat educated on what the master plan entails. I would say that this is a case where less is more. I hope you will allow more time for people to review the plan and comment.	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Deborah Weinmann	<p>I had the opportunity to observe the Beaver Pond area for several months (April-June) as part of a Western Washington University Natural History class project.</p> <p>I am attaching a map showing the Beaver Pond pedestrian only trail because it is not shown on the trail map provided on the PGFHP planning committee website. I have indicated on the attached map the main Beaver Pond pedestrian trail as Class 2 and the spur trail as Class 1, so you would know which parts of the trail I am referring to.</p> <p>I believe the Beaver Pond pedestrian trail should be designated Class 2 and the spur trail Class 1, possibly decommissioning the spur trail.</p> <p>Having been a user of the land for 15+ years, there was a time when most of the trails, excluding the logging roads, were Class 1 or 2 trails. Obviously, those days are gone. However, the Beaver Pond pedestrian trail is one of the few trails, possibly the only one, where a variety of beautiful native wildflowers still bloom along the pathway edges. Particularly lovely is the fragrant fringe cup (<i>Tellima grandiflora</i>) in the spring. Because trails which provide simple pleasures have become less common, they are highly valued, especially by observant walkers. The entire Beaver Pond pedestrian trail measures approximately 0.2 miles. The delightful trail represents a very small segment of the entire trail system. As such, a Class 2 designation would have very little impact on other trail users. In contrast, widening this treasured pathway to a Class 3 trail would decimate many of the native flora growing along the edges.</p> <p>Subsequently, the sense of place experienced by long-time users of the trail would be lost. And, the impact of losing numerous native plant species on other living organisms in the area is unknown.</p> <p>The spur trail, identified as Class 1 on the map, is presently starting to go under water due to nearby beaver activity. Moving the wooden fence, currently going under water at the trail's</p>	Edit Proposed	Recommend confirming mapping and references to beaver pond area call for Class 2 trail. No further edits recommended.

	<p>end, back to where the spur trail begins at the junction near the viewing platform would provide wildlife with a quiet haven. Minimally, designating the spur trail as Class 1, signals to trail users they are approaching a sensitive area.</p> <p>The main pedestrian trail, identified as Class 2 on the map, leads to the wildlife viewing platform. Based on my own regular observations, the area is used by a multitude of native birds, waterfowl in particular. At least twice, Canadian geese have been observed nesting on a stump in the middle of the pond. In addition, countless other native birds and waterfowl families such as hooded mergansers, wigeons, and mallards, have been seen using the wetland area for nesting and raising their young or simply visiting. It appears, herons, eagles, and other wildlife species go back and forth from the wetlands to Port Gamble Bay. No doubt, the Beaver Pond area meets both the needs of wildlife as well as opportunities for human enjoyment.</p> <p>In closing, designating the Beaver Pond pedestrian trail as Class 2 and the spur trail as Class 1 would ensure the needs of flora and fauna are valued while still allowing adequate human access.</p>		
Doug Maraist	In Section 5 - PARK RECOMMENDATIONS (pg. 142) this is somewhat acknowledged but these two Masterplan sections need to be better coordinated &/or referenced.	Edit Proposed	Confirm consistency between sections. No further edits recommended.
Joseph Lubischer	<p>OVERALL. Let's be clear. This was not a master plan, but a "developed facilities plan". The major decisions had already been made--ride park, access road, Stottlemeyer parking, STO route, landscape classifications, and trails.</p> <p>PROCESS. There is nothing on this webpage that identifies the final comment period or the due date for final comments.</p> <p>The chat room style as a public comment process was minimal and deficient. There was no opportunity for clarification of questions or answers. There was no opportunity for discussing issues in any detailed or sophisticated manner.</p> <p>FORESTRY AND RESTORATION. It appears roughly 3/4 of the park area will consist of recent or planned clear cuts? The PROS Plan places great importance on natural habitat, whereas this master plan focuses mostly on facility development. The master plan should contain specifics of restoration activities, costs, and timelines.</p> <p>The forestry plan requires an immediate update.</p> <p>GIS MAPPING. The GIS mapping feature was very nice, but several layers are inadequate (see below). The land-scape classification layer required over a dozen steps to display.</p> <p>The wetland layer is sparse, indicating a field delineation should have been done.</p> <p>Stream and wetland buffers are missing. Buffers are an essential planning tool for forestry, landscape classifications, and development.</p>	Edit Proposed	Recommendations for FAQ clarifications and methodology for mapping as stated previously, no further edits recommended

	<p>Surface geology layer has incorrect units. Glacial till is called out as 'gravel', alluvium as 'peat', and 'high slope' is not a geologic unit. DNR data should have been used.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE CLASSIFICATIONS. The GIS map shows the classifications were extended southward from the last 2015 mapping. When and by whom were the extended classifications made? Were there any changes to the 2015 classifications? Creating the landscape classifications should have been part of the public process. The landscape classification map must be shown as a stand-alone figure.</p> <p>MANAGEMENT. The plan does not address agency conflicts between Parks and Public Works.</p>		
Kim Greenwood	<p>Sustainable Community Forestry Issues: As much as I like mountain views, I do not favor view corridors. Maintenance is additional cost to the park and views are not critical to restoring to a more natural forest.</p> <p>Proposed recreation facilities: There needs to be an enormous and ongoing education/indoctrination outreach about pack it in/pack it out. From my observations, anytime picnicing is encouraged, people leave litter. This will be a huge problem with wildlife that should be left wild. Littering people leads to interactions with wildlife that can result in killing of wildlife to keep people safe. I don't want to see this happen. Right now throughout the park, it's very clean. There is some garbage around the parking areas. Once more people come in, there will be more garbage unfortunately because there are many in our society who don't see littering as a problem. We need bear proof cans and regular/weekly garbage pick up. This is another cost for the park if it's going to be developed in places.</p>	Edit Proposed	Add notes where applicable that event staging and view corridors can also serve as fire breaks. Add reference to need for waste management within infrastructure section
Linda Berry-Maraist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pg 107 map: New "natural" designated areas east & west of Bayview trailhead and along the STO near the beaver pond should be analyzed in larger detail. What would this do the Ranger corridor that County has approved? What about existing trails and the future STO? Parking appears to not be allowed at the Bayview shoreline trailhead. Will expansion of the Bayview west trailhead be allowed? Has Ride Park been reduced? 	Edit Proposed	Confirm consistency between sections. No further edits recommended.

<p>Linda Berry-Maraist</p>	<p>2015 Map restrictions and zone restrictions (pg 107-115):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yellow: perhaps ½ the park is colored yellow for conservation which is defined (pg 108 & 109) as No pets, livestock or organized large group activities. Will horses, dogs and trail events be excluded from all areas w/ this designation? How will a horse back rider access the park from the new Stottelmeyer trailhead? • Brown-passive recreation says, “no large recreational events”. If trail events are considered recreational events, they would be limited to just a small portion of the park near the Ride Park. Continuity of trails is essential for trail events. • Orange-active recreation: “impacts of large events need to be mitigated”. What does that mean? <p>Pg 114- Should clarify what type of motorized bikes would be allowed in the Ride Park and Active recreation areas? Is this ebikes, or dirt bikes and motorcycles? (This entire park was always planned for non-motorized trails, not dirt bikes) Limited speed ebikes could be allowed on logging roads.</p> <p>Disc golf is treated inconsistently.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting 1: 200 people. Lots of young people attended interested in Disc Golf. Measured participant support by asking for 1 or 2 words (computer rejected input that was not one word). One-word single issues rose to top; “hiking, biking, disc-golf, recreation, conservation”. • Pg 91: “There was little support for a disc golf course so that was eliminated” <p>December '21 Feedback on 3 alternative Plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questionnaire regarding preference from 3 schematic options (data on pg 91) was not a landslide either for more or less park facilities. 42% wanted the least amount of facilities. Using this data for a conclusion there was almost no community support for increased recreation development seems wrong. <p>A (least park development) B (mid-level of park development) C (more park facility development)</p> <p>165 (42%) 89 (22%) 137 (35%)</p> <p>Community preference for local use vs encouraging tourism, majority in survey thought park should support both:</p> <p>Appendices pg 78 question 12: What is the primary purpose of the park?</p> <p>Local Use Tourism Both local use and Tourism</p> <p>164 (42%) 6 (2%) 218 (56%)</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>This is a guidance document. It is only proposing future action. Words like prohibit, shall or must are not appropriate. Change language throughout the document to “limit uses and/or facilities” rather than these directive terms. However, certain activities should be avoided in these areas to protect environmental features. Trails and other facilities should only be located if topography, existing uses or other unavoidable circumstances exist.</p> <p>Note regarding e-bikes for future policy reference. Reference state definition of motorized bike (ebike) and as regulated by state statute. No further edits recommended.</p>
----------------------------	--	----------------------	---

<p>Patrice Tullai</p>	<p>2. A SEPA assessment needs to be prepared for the Draft Master Plan. The consultants themselves state that SEPA “prohibits the ‘piecemealing’ of projects so the project in its entirety will be included as part of the SEPA review”. No SEPA analysis has been done on this project as a whole, and needs to be done. Once the analysis is complete, the public would require additional time for public review and comment. Hard copies of the draft plan, analysis (including SEPA analysis), and maps should be available for review at public locations such as libraries, as well the Kitsap County Parks office.</p> <p>6. The process through which this plan was developed appears to have favored mountain bikers and does not appear to represent the majority of potential users. A number of trails are designated for mountain bike use only and the 170-acre Ride Park development will be dedicated to mountain bikers. Mountain biking, with its needed trail building and maintenance, impact the ability of wildlife to use their habitat. There have been numerous studies that have documented the adverse impact of mountain biker trails on the natural resources of a park, including increased erosion and impacts to vegetation and wildlife. Note also that the Ride Park itself is located in an area which is designated as having unstable steep slopes with historical landslides.</p> <p>7. While there is acreage set aside for mountain bikers only, there is no corresponding acreage set aside exclusively for walkers and horseback riders who constitute the majority of users . The multi-use designation applied to the majority of trails results in both safety issues and excessive wear and tear on trails used by bikers. Mountain biking can be dangerous; a biker was paralyzed from an accident on Ranger Trail in this park. Very bold signage had to be put up to direct bike traffic and walkers in an effort to avoid future accidents. How is liability being handled by the county when there are accidents at PGFHP? Trails that were once single track paths, have doubled in width due to bike traffic. Compare the Bluff Trail with Stumps as an example; a few years ago Stumps looked like Bluff looks today. Bikes cause erosion, root death, and tree die-back. Horseback riders and walkers need trails devoted to them. Please consider holding an open public discussion on the issue of multi-use trails to propose options.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>2. Noted, and recommend discussing SEPA process in FAQ as previously mentioned.</p> <p>6. Noted, no edits recommended</p> <p>7. Noted for future trail planning, no edits recommended.</p> <p>As a guidance document, the Framework does not direct future action nor does it act as a step in any approval process, permit, policy or otherwise. Future efforts towards the recreational and education components for the Framework will require planning level SEPA review once incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan, Parks Recreation and Open Space plan or similar document. The Park projects that predated the beginning of Framework development had previously received planning-level SEPA review. The Mountain Biking Ride Park and Stottlemeyer Trailhead are allowed uses in the Parks zone and their potential impacts (at a planning level) were determined when they received this zoning. The</p>
-----------------------	--	----------------------	---

			<p>Sound to Olympics Trail (STO) was considered with the adoption of the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Non-Motorized Facility Plan in 2013. Again, these impacts were assessed at a planning level. Additional project-level SEPA review is required when project permits are submitted. This level of review covers specific traffic and other impacts based on known trip generation and other metrics. Such permits are currently in review for the Mountain Biking Ride Park and Stottlemeyer Trailhead and will be required for construction of the STO segments in the future.</p>
Jay Zischke	<p>Pg 107 – Land Use - agree the idea of introducing a 6th (new) land classification for Heritage Parks – “Conservation Education” is a good idea - suggest the County engage all Heritage Park Stewardship Groups for review of proposed language.</p> <p>Trails section - general comments; appreciate the concept of evolving to larger loop trails through decommissioning and revisions post logging. May need to consider more one way travel over time as well as ped only trails</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Edie Lau	Also, what are "type 2" and "type 3" trails (referenced on page 108)? I searched but could not find a definition.	Edit Proposed	Include definitions and descriptions for each classification of trail in the Trails section, and consider supporting graphic.

Conservation Section			
Randena Walsh	<p>The plan to "help save this forest" brought many groups and individuals together to save critical wildlife habitat and protect the health of Port Gamble Bay, part of Kitsap County's natural resources "heritage," thus the name Heritage Park. While I understand that Rayonier retains logging rights until 2022, the clearcuts have rapidly expanded since the land has been purchased. I would like more effort to be put into replanting with diverse tree species sooner rather than later, and avoiding such huge swaths of clearcuts that turn into scotch broom landscapes,</p> <p>I believe if we focus on creative ways to restore our over-harvested timber land we would be better served in the long run. I have hiked these roads and trails for 20 years, enjoying the beautiful forests, native plant observation, wildlife observation, mushroom hunting and huckleberry picking. This is the heritage I had imagined leaving for future generations when I donated to the Kitsap Forest and Bay Fund.</p> <p>I hope we will make our top priority restoring the park's natural environment. I am opposed to construction within the park such as yurts and other buildings requiring more dollars for maintenance.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Jim & Marilyn DeRoy	<p>We believe the best option for PGFHP is to focus on the goals of conservation and restoration of the natural resources of the park, in combination with light recreation - hiking, mountain biking, horseback-riding. We feel that the plan options that invite construction of commercial venues, various buildings, and campgrounds are not in line with these goals and would be a detriment to the biodiversity and wildlife corridors that this park could otherwise offer.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Jim & Marilyn DeRoy	<p>We are writing in regards to the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Master Plan. We have been involved in this park, as well as others in the county, helping to build and maintain trails and structures, as well as to install signs. As far as options related to the master plan, we would like the goals of the park to focus on conservation and restoration of the natural resources, with the continuation of light recreation - hiking, mountain biking, horseback riding. We feel that the plan options allowing for construction of commercial venues, various buildings, and campgrounds are not in line with these goals and would be a detriment to the biodiversity and wildlife corridors that this park could otherwise offer.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended

<p>Margaret Tufft</p>	<p>First, I think for the most part, the community has been left out of the process. As people who serve the public, I'm sure that you all have a good idea how challenging it can be to make the public aware of what's going on in the greater community, even though it affects them. This project has been worked on for many years, but the outreach has been lacking, especially considering your awareness of the challenge of informing the public. This shouldn't be a reason to give unrealistic deadlines, when the process has been ongoing for years. Two hundred pages in two weeks? People have many things that can distract, but that doesn't detract from the care that people have about their community.</p> <p>The first meeting, the public who attended, overwhelmingly said that they wanted the park left in a natural state, with few changes. Right now, it seems like it's more a proposal to turn it into a theme park.</p> <p>There is and will be so much growth in Kitsap County, the public generally, would like a natural place to go and recharge. This has not really been addressed. At the last meeting, the concern about preserving ecosystems and nature, seemed to be being talked around, not really taking on this concern. There also seems to be interest groups that are being given more weight than others. This should not be.</p> <p>What all these changes could do to affect the flora and fauna have not been addressed. The hydrology has not been addressed. A full SEPA review has not been done. What the climate may do in respect to our area also doesn't seem to be considered. The park has a chance of helping with climate mitigation, but it won't if we destroy much of the ecosystem there. I implore you to take this into serious consideration.</p> <p>I respectfully request that you postpone any decision concerning the park, and refocus on the many issues not adequately addressed, and to get substantial input from the citizens of our county. This can be done with more public meetings. Now that there is more flexibility to meeting in person, there could be smaller neighborhood meetings, so people could be informed and there could be a discussion. Of course, more virtual meetings could also be had. It's important, especially in a time where many sense that their voice is not being listened to. This can be repaired in the best way at a community level. I implore you all to see the process through, in its entirety.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended</p>
-----------------------	---	----------------------	------------------------------------

Joe Lubischer	<p>FORESTRY AND RESTORATION. It appears roughly 3/4 of the park area will consist of recent or planned clear cuts? The PROS Plan places great importance on natural habitat, whereas this master plan focuses mostly on recreation development. Perhaps plans are afoot elsewhere, but shouldn't more specifics of restoration activities, costs, and timelines be included at this stage? Have relative proportions of development versus forestry costs been estimated? Is an update of the current forest plan under consideration?</p> <p>GIS MAPPING. Wow, this is an unusual tool to provide as part of the public review!</p> <p>LANDSCAPE CLASSIFICATIONS. The GIS map shows the classifications were extended southward from the last 2015 mapping. When and by whom were the newer classifications made? As a basic planning tool for Parks, shouldn't the landscape classifications be shown as a stand-alone figure in the plan?</p> <p>WETLANDS. Though I don't have sufficient site-specific knowledge, the wetland layer appeared sparse. I would have expected many more areas, especially seeps on slopes dropping to lower elevations. What are the data sources? Should a recommendation for a field delineation be considered?</p> <p>BUFFERS. Stream and wetland buffers are an essential planning tool for forestry, landscape classifications, and development. Buffers would be an important addition to the GIS mapping.</p> <p>SURFACE GEOLOGY. This layer appears to have some issues compared to DNR mapping. Glacial till is called out as 'gravel', alluvium as 'peat', and 'high slope' is not a geologic unit.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Steve Weagant	I agree with the position taken by the Kingston Environmental Council that the proposed master plan for PGFHP does not address the environmental impact to the park. There is too much emphasis on development and not enough on conservation. I remember that this purchase was led by Fortera and involved great support from GPC and their donors. I don't think these proposals do justice to their efforts. Respectfully	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Katherine Lewis-Hawk	<p>I hope the forest remains a forest with trails, without the proposed developments of access trails for walkers, bikers, etc. despite how some may want those additions for their recreation or their commerce. Since our county is so quickly arriving at a greater human population, I hope for spaces left for the very ancient wild residents to live in relative peace.</p> <p>I don't care much for the ask of multiple studies to prove the reasons for this because those are expensive and there are so many other places for that money- low-income housing for one. Instead, I find this simply a matter of common sense. We humans need company of other than our own species to be better humans- to think beyond ourselves, to be more compassionate, to relax in the natural world.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended

Jayne Larson	<p>When we have many, many roads in Kitsap County that are NOT paved but that our Waste Management, emergency services, USPS and other services require, why are we paving roads through the public parkland that includes some critical areas? Paved roads are not compatible with good watershed management. Even the plan recognizes that the park basically falls into a critical area for aquifer recharge, (see page 60). We should not be squandering our freshwater resource like cities in southern California where the water needs to be piped in from far away mountains. Future water costs will skyrocket if we have to find outside sources and means to deliver them here in Kitsap. In that case, the water costs would be born by every single resident. Let's pave roads that we already have and need and not pave roads through the park like the STO.</p> <p>You call the Sound-To-Olympics a trail but, in fact, it is a road, vehicle ready, built by Public Works who build roads. Think heavy equipment, bulldozers, excavators and the associated soil compression, invasives introduction via tire treads. People on Bainbridge Island were aghast when the short segment along Hwy 305 was built and that was so much less invasive since it already lay within the existing road prism. There will be a hue and cry from Kitsap citizens who are concerned about the environment, when they see, perhaps too late, the impact of that road building.</p> <p>Be aware of what you are doing.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Randena Walsh	<p>I agree with all of the Kitsap Environmental Coalition comments made on the Master Plan. More time for public comment and more environmental review are needed before approval of this plan.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Kim Greenwood	<p>Land Conservation and Restoration: "The plan also recommends revisions to the existing restoration plan and specific forest blocks to align forest management priorities with envisioned recreational uses." If this means that recreational uses will take priority over forest conservation and restoration, or if there is a risk that that could happen, then I do not agree with this statement.</p> <p>Land Use: I think a more appropriate land use for the southernmost square of the park (Sawdust Hill) is "HP-NA". It is remote, steep and small and not suitable for trails.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended

Patrice Tullai	<p>3. The analysis of critical areas and wetlands is not complete. The one map of wetlands only includes the east part of the Park, not the west portion. Drainage is not adequately described including clear identification of fish bearing streams. There is not adequate discussion of how drainage will be managed as part of trail and facility development.</p> <p>4. There has been no formal wildlife survey done at PGFHP. Since there is little information on what wildlife is in the park, it is difficult to evaluate how development and the placement of the STO will impact wildlife and their corridors.</p> <p>5. The public has overwhelmingly expressed a preference for conservation and restoration, over development at PGFHP. The Draft Master Plan proposes a much greater level of development including glamping facilities, a Tree Adventure course, the 170-acre Ride Park, View Corridors, and other park infrastructure. While park planners say they are taking a nature-based approach, they are bypassing the deeper ecosystem-based planning that is needed for real conservation and restoration. This proposed plan does not appear to reflect the public's desire.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
	<p>We realize that highly competent professionals and many volunteers have been involved in developing this draft Master Plan, but at a minimum we believe a complete environmental assessment of the park's natural resources is required. Doing that would provide more opportunity to have a real public discussion about how the park's importance both to the natural ecosystem and to the entire community can best be protected.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Bruce McCain	<p>As a resident of North Kitsap County, I am deeply concerned that the subject Master Plan is lacking a meaningful, holistic, science-based environmental assessment of the Park. It appears that what assessments that are proposed would be done in a limited, piecemeal manner. For example, few wetland surveys have been conducted. Moreover, limited on-site wildlife assessments have been done. In order to properly assess the effects of the trails and structures proposed for the Park, these environmental studies need to be done.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
Nancy and Ronald Shefton	<p>My husband (Ronald L. Sefton) and I (Nancy Sefton) wish to object to the current Draft Master Plan for Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park. Once again, it appears that Big Money wins out over the need to save Kitsap's natural heritage. Already, trees are coming down in order to build new structures, eliminating wildlife refuges and places for narrow, dirt trails through thriving forests.</p> <p>Allowing our forests to stand as they are costs nothing. But clear-cutting trees once again and then re-planting, costs a small fortune, and it will be decades before new, mature trees, will once again grace the area. Must big money ALWAYS win?? "Conservation costs much less than restoration."</p> <p>The future plans for this currently forested area, as things stand now, carry the unfortunate vision of impermeable asphalt trails with their dangerous bicycle trails and other environmental impacts, all at high costs. Further, profits from the current master plan will only</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended

	<p>make off-county realtors and builders richer, leaving Kitsap County minus a thriving forested area for years to come. Once again, \$\$ wins. Must it?</p>		
<p>Sue DeArman</p>	<p>1. The public has stated that their wish is that the heritage park be preserved, and they contributed money thinking that there would be minimal development. Now we see that the plan for the park does not reflect that. There needs to be an open public forum on this draft plan before getting approval from the Parks Advisory Board and the Board of County Commissioners.</p> <p>2. Where is the concern for the environment in this park? The park needs to come together as a whole and do a wildlife assessment, wetlands delineation and an up to date SEPA review. Additionally, we need an EIS for the project as a whole. This is the biggest park in the nation and must contain professional environmental assessments!</p> <p>3. I am very much against the planned STO going through the PGFHP. Pavement contains toxic chemicals and will harm our amphibians that are already threatened through climate change and habitat destruction. Let us NOT add to their demise through our actions!.</p> <p>4. The PGFHP seems to be focusing on the mountain biking community. I feel that the walkers and equestrians need more devoted trails in our park. As you probably already know if you've walked in the park as I do, it is hard to hear the bikes coming up behind you and it is my experience that few bikers ring a bell or alert you in time for you to get off the trail and out of their way. As the park is now, it's an accident waiting to happen. The signage in the park as it now stands gives the bikers the right of way. I feel the signage should be the other way around and should state that bikers must yield to walkers and equestrians.</p> <p>5. It appears that the development in our PGFHP is moving forward with the hope of bringing tourist dollars into the park. It is essential that these dollars stay in our parks! The ongoing upkeep of a park of this size will require money and the park cannot rely solely on park volunteers.</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended</p>

	<p>Last but not least, when will the Port Gamble S’Klallam and Suquamish nations input become part of the PGFHP plan? Will the public be informed about the review of tribal legal counsel, advisors, and scientists on the plan for PGFHP?</p>		
<p>Edie Lau</p>	<p>3. From attending most, if not all, of the public meetings, I heard a number of people speak passionately about the need to preserve parts of the park for wildlife, and fears that recreational development would destroy habitat. The preamble text on the website strangely doesn’t name any particular species making their home in the park. I believe the county does recognize the public’s desire to share the park with wildlife but I can see why wildlife advocates think it does not. I suggest adding language in the preamble and executive summary that speaks more directly to and passionately about public appreciation for and wish to share the space with other species.</p> <p>In the section about natural areas, I read that the Stewardship Committee recommends limiting access and requiring permits but that such a restriction is not allowed, per the acquisition agreement. This is disappointing. I support placing all allowable controls to limit impacts on natural areas, including prohibiting dogs. (I say this as someone who loves walking</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Noted, no edits recommended</p>

	my dogs in the forest. But I recognize that they're not great for wildlife.) I couldn't tell for sure from the maps, but if there are new trails planned for natural areas, how about skipping those additions?		
Mary Gleysteen	<p>I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the Master Plan for the Pt Gamble Heritage Park, but urge a more thorough and robust exploration and discussion the park's place in our community and its ever at risk ecosystem, with an eye to preservation and restoration of this treasure which so many people worked so hard to acquire.</p> <p>I believe that consultation with and assent from the Port Gamble S'Klallam and Suquamish tribes is crucial to adoption of any plan for this property and that SEPA analysis is warranted, followed by adequate opportunity for public review and comment.</p> <p>Finally, I must mention I am troubled by the apparent emphasis on development for mountain biking and the deference in planning given to the successors of Pope Resources and OPG from whom this property was acquired at considerable public expense.</p>	Comment Noted	Noted, no edits recommended
			In general for all above comments, recommend addressing the shared concerns with FAQ

Estimates and Funding Section			
Jayne Larson	<p>My concerns about this plan, and I'm sure there are others like myself, is that the plan spends significant pages discussing the financial opportunities, but these financial opportunities are still very much "pie-in-the sky". Any development within the park should NOT place additional tax burdens on local residents, many of whom do not support or use the park, nor would use the developed amenities. Most of the developments are geared toward people from outside Kitsap, and those amenities/concessions should be self-supporting and not result in a special tax district and tax levy. Furthermore, in several areas of the plan, (ex; page 57), the local residents and current users of the park are discussed in a very deprecating way, in spite of the fact that local residents and current users are targeted for potential tax increases. I think the key question that needs to be addressed and answered is: Should the County be in the concessions/development business? What are our taxes going for? Why do we need to develop our public parks, which we have helped to purchase? And who is really benefitting from this development? It's clearly not the current users and local residents.</p>	Edit Proposed	<p>Noted for future capital program planning. Recommend reviewing language under "Stakeholder Engagement" section to ensure reflection cannot be misread. As a guidance document, this Framework includes aspirations for the Park many of which may not be attainable due to lack of interest, funding or other obstacles. However, the document does analyze the opportunities as a foundation for future discussion.</p>
Joe Lubischer	<p>BUDGET. If understood correctly, the plan projects a required annual tax support of \$1.5M to \$2.6M compared to the current Parks budget of about \$4.6M. Acknowledging that Parks is severely underfunded, the size of the projected expenditure would still call for a County-level analysis and review on the magnitude and sources of funding for the park system. A reasonable concern is that PGFHP would drain resources at the expense of all the other parks, while doing so in part to benefit the private Pope/Rayonier development project.</p>	Edit Proposed	<p>Add note in O&M that acknowledges that the current County budget does not support long-term O&M costs for the current condition of the park and that additional revenue will be needed, especially once Rayonier is no longer contributing to maintenance. The County acknowledges that any park improvements and expansions will need to include funding outside of the existing Parks budget prior to development. The</p>

			Parks existing condition including trails and the Ride Park will be addressed in the Parks budget as well as maintenance agreements with partners and stewards.
Joseph Lubischer	<p>BUDGET. The plan projects a required annual financing of \$0.9M to \$1.6M for O&M of developed facilities and forestry work (per last public meeting). Parks' anemic budget is about \$4.6M, pre-Covid level.</p> <p>This plan will drain resources at the expense of all the other parks, while doing so in part to benefit the private Pope/Rayonier development project.</p> <p>The only financing source proposed appears to be a special taxing district, which would raise North Kitsap taxes about 2%. That will be a very tough sell.</p>	Edit Proposed	<p>Same note as above.</p> <p>While a Metropolitan Parks District may be one mechanism for funding any impacts to property owners would be dictated by the funding level proposed in the measure which is currently unknown.</p>
Jay Zischke	<p>Chapter 7 Funding - depicts a woefully inadequate funding situation for KC parks department. It appears (although lacking a recommendation) that a Parks and Recreation taxing district would likely be the most secure direction - ?</p>	Comment Noted	<p>Noted, no edits recommended.</p> <p>If uses are to be expanded in the Park, multiple additional funding sources may need to be explored for construction and ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>These partnerships, arrangements and mechanisms must be a beginning part of future discussion of new educational or recreation uses.</p>

Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Comments Matrix



Comments from local Indigenous Tribes, the Parks Advisory Board, and Advisory Groups were provided orally during in-person reviews of the draft document. Any written comments provided prior to the acceptance of the Framework document will be evaluated for consideration.

Comment	Action	Response
Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe Comments		
Want to make sure there will still be opportunity in future phases for participation - recommend including in narrative	Edit Proposed	Will add into write-up under Tribal section
Comments will likely come with a caveat that the Tribe would like to comment in more detail in future phases	Comment Noted	Acknowledged, no edit
Figure 2.4 needs to be updated to reflect the conservation easement that the Tribe has Alternative master plan 2 is more accurate (https://www.portgamble.com/current-projects/master-plan/)	Edit Proposed	Change to Alternative 2 from Rayonier
Page 113: Bike Events permitted in HP-NA - questionable	Edit Proposed	Change to "N" to be consistent with HP-NA Restrictions
Harvesting - need to clarify in the document what the conditions are for harvesting and use, or that the tribe will be involved in the development of a stewardship document	Edit Proposed	Be specific in Land Use descriptions to explicitly clarify conditions for general public, with note that Tribal Harvesting will be in accordance with applicable agreements
Add comment that clarifies the County's stance on herbicide use in connection to harvesting	Edit Proposed	Explicitly state that the project team recommends to the County for the use of herbicides, but note that herbicides are currently not authorized in County parks
Take a look at the proposed additional trailhead in the northeast area within conservation area - wouldn't we want to reduce/restrict additional access here?	Edit Proposed	This is a guidance document. It is only proposing future action. Words like prohibit, shall or must are not appropriate. Change language throughout the document to "limit uses and/or facilities" rather than these directive terms. Certain activities should be avoided in these areas to protect environmental features. Trails and other facilities should only be located if topography, existing uses or other unavoidable circumstances exist.
List of policy and program recommendations - many of them the Tribe would like to be involved with	Edit Proposed	Recommend an asterisk on "Description" column with note under table for County to Coordinate with Tribes on any policy and program changes
In general, the tribe would like to be more involved in future planning, especially in areas that wouldn't necessitate a permit that triggers their review	Edit Proposed	Not above captures intent

<p>Consider looking into Business Improvement District within economic development planning, especially with the synergy between the park and the town</p> <p>If and when the County chooses to proceed with developing a campground/glamping facilities</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Good comment for County, no edit</p>
<p>Tribe's Preference is that the campground would NOT be used for personal use, rather in support of the education and research component</p> <p>Primary concern with outside visitors overnight and potential impact to park and bay</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Revise language to show campground use is prioritized for education use but allowed for recreational and others when not needed.</p> <p>Remove all references to camp site at Shoreline, add that this was proposed early in the process.</p>
<p>Clarify the funding of the forestry program. It currently reads that funding is through thinning, which eventually wouldn't fund. Want to ensure that replanting of cash trees wouldn't continue to support funding only</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Clarify that any funding from selective thinning and forestry management will be limited to the replanting efforts from any clearcut operations or existing stands, and that replanting will only be for the purposes of forest restoration, and that the park will not continue to be a working forest for the purposes of revenue generation</p>
<p>Would like to include language in concessionaires to include tribal concessionaires as well to offer opportunities and partnership</p> <p>Recommend starting to look into a formal partnership agreement in the near future, immediate in phase 1</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Concur, revise language to specifically develop goals for Indigenous-owned and operated businesses.</p> <p>Add formal partnership development to the Implementation plan.</p>

Suquamish Tribe Comments		
Need to be clear at the public meeting that this is not going to be adopted by ordinance, and will only serve as a guideline for future potential projects	Comment Noted	Acknowledged, no edit
Wetland buffers should be listed consistently on 60/61 refer to how it's listed on page 61 References a qualifier per county ordinance, ensure this is listed on page 60 as well for consistency	Edit Proposed	Correct language on page 60 and 61 for consistency
Page 74 - concern with blanket "100ft or less" regarding buffers, may be more than 100ft	Edit Proposed	Include statement in parenthesis after statement that states unless otherwise specified by County or State requirements
Trails shown as blue lines - consider showing as a different color to not confuse as streams	Edit Proposed	Change mapped trail lines from Blue - to be reserved for water per typical mapping colors and patterns
Would like to see mapping/appendices	Comment Noted	Acknowledged, no edit
Also concerned with campground use	Edit Proposed	Remove all references to camp site at Shoreline, It was never a recommendation of the County due to potential conflicts with the shoreline. Noted comment for other campground
Want to ensure that interpretive signage planning language references working closely with both Tribes Who all will be involved and what the purpose is	Edit Proposed	Asterisk and note on implementation plan, include note in coordination with Tribes for all references to interpretive signage. Refer to signage planning section.
Concern that there are trails in areas designated as natural areas	Edit Proposed	Recommend consideration of class and user restrictions on existing trails, and consider decommissioning trails where appropriate

<p>Tribe would like to see trails in those areas decommissioned People wouldn't be excluded from these areas if permitted, but don't want general use in those areas</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>This is a guidance document. It is only proposing future action. Words like prohibit, shall or must are not appropriate. Change language throughout the document to "limit uses and/or facilities" rather than these directive terms. However, certain activities should be avoided in these areas to protect environmental features. Trails and other facilities should only be located if topography, existing uses or other unavoidable circumstances exist.</p>
<p>Passive areas were the only areas specifically allowing harvesting (Pg108/109) Tribe wants to ensure that tribal access is authorized in all areas, not just those specific areas</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add statement to intro to land use table on p.107 stating that tribal harvesting/collecting is allowed in all areas per tribal agreements. Change authorized to allowed consistent with treaty rights. This would only be applicable if some areas are explicitly restricted.</p>

Parks Advisory Board Comments		
<p>Kathryn Thompson: Feel that the process has been done with good intentions Addressed confusion about why Rayonier is still logging - Rayonier retains the rights Noted that there are ongoing efforts to procure timber rights but that's not part of the scope of the plan Promoted the goals of the park and highlighted the minimal footprint of the development plans</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Note, no edit</p>
<p>Confused why the classifications were altered from the stewardship plan Noted the two areas that are proposed to be changed Specifically the area that was changed from conservation to active recreation Specifically in the plan on page 175, it states that the changes to active recreation is in the shoreline block, this is a typo and should be corrected to the eastern block</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add statement to land use section explaining purpose - refer to page 175 in master plan recommendations section. Statement should reflect update since 2016 stewardship plan. Confirm this is inaccurate. Recommend statement that states any changes from 2016 stewardship plan are more conservative. Correct statement in Tree Stand 22 section to reflect that this area is within the eastern block.</p>
<p>It would be helpful if those tree stands were labeled on that map - this seems like an important figure.</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add dashed outline of tree stands (can be approximate to minimize mapping needs)</p>
<p>Concern that the public's interest is in no development, but the plan states that this is not sustainable</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Acknowledged, no specific edits recommended</p>
<p>Alex commented on the Parks Dept budget and abilities to maintain and operate the park</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Note, no edit</p>

<p>Don't like the note and concept of bringing in concessionaires into the park Specifically don't want to lease land to third parties and could contractually be stuck with them</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Change language of concessionaires to third-party vendors or something that's more appropriate with intent. The Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park is of a size, scale and range of uses that multiple partnerships will be necessary. Due to this, the Park must be managed more broadly. Public/private partnerships such as the one with EMBA for the Ride Park will be necessary. Leases may be employed for educational or other facilities to meet their potential and be properly maintained over time. Kitsap has such leases in its parks and they are developed carefully for full protection of the County and its Parks assets.</p>
<p>Linda noted that the Kitsap Forest and Bay Coalition provided a comment to consider the timber harvest in the efforts to procure the land for the park, making the park affordable (2013) Statement noted a replanting a mix of native species</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add summary of history of park procurement and planning efforts within introduction or planning context section. Confirm if accurate, want to avoid documenting that Rayonier will replant a mix of species if not supported financially.</p>
<p>Would like to include in the plan more information about the partnerships and coalition that has gone into the history and development of the park - specifically touching on the timber deeds and support for procurement</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add summary of history of park procurement and planning efforts within introduction or planning context section</p>
<p>Concern with changes to land classification Exemption for STO Conservation Area restricts pets and livestock which restricts certain user groups Concern with restrictions on events, as biking running, hiking events will utilize the extent of the park</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add clarification on why changes are recommended to the 2016 stewardship plan. Confirm if exemption for paved trail is required and note in land use tables. This is a guidance document. It is only proposing future action. Words like prohibit, shall or must are not appropriate. Change language throughout the document to "limit uses and/or facilities" rather than these directive terms. However, certain activities should be avoided in these areas to protect environmental features. Trails and other facilities should only be located if topography, existing uses or other unavoidable circumstances exist. Recommend adding unless otherwise permitted by the County.</p>

<p>Concern that "active recreation" is limited to mountain bike park Per the PROS plan, mountain biking is considered active recreation, which implies that mountain bikes are not allowed throughout the rest of the park Not clear in the document - need to define</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>There seems to be some overlap between specialized recreation and active recreation, need to confirm. Event staging and water trail access are listed as specialized, but mapping is inconsistent with plan. Need to confirm, may need statement that mountain bikes are authorized throughout park unless otherwise noted per restrictions. Define active recreation.</p>
<p>Plan repeatedly states the need for funds to operate and maintain the park The plan doesn't solve this problem unless the voters approve a capital measure Without the approval of taxes Need to have a plan in case voters won't approve a measure</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Rename document to PGFHP Framework, and change all references to master plan or plan. Clarify throughout document when referencing phasing, implementation, or cost that recommended projects will be contingent on funding, partnerships, and ongoing community support - consistent with phasing section of recommendations.</p>
<p>Need to clarify that this is a guidance document, and not a regulatory document</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Rename document to PGFHP Framework</p>
<p>Noted that prior attempt to establish a parks district was not supported by many Unsure what a parks district structure would even look like given that Bainbridge and Kingston have one Makes the tax support for this plan harder</p>	<p>Comment Noted</p>	<p>Acknowledged, no specific edits recommended</p>
<p>Concern that the implementation plan places the burden of a majority of the plan on the parks Need more clarification on the partnerships and grants needed and that all of the plan is contingent on those being in place</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Same note as above, ensure consistent language when referencing phasing, implementation, or funding</p>
<p>Recommend that the plan go to the BoCC to start review process only with above comments/changes addressed and clarifying that this is only a guidance document Would like to see an in-person conversation also included in the process Want to come back to the PAB to review recommended edits to the plan</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Timeline changed and Document name to change</p>

Want to revisit in May meeting Moved to table the plan until next meeting		
--	--	--

Rayonier Comments		
Noting the long and unique partnership at the beginning of the document. Particularly how the timber deed relates to the size of the park. Overview of acquisition process and project history.	Edit Proposed	Add summary of history to intro or planning context
Noting agreements pertaining to decommissioning logging roads, replanting/green up, option to purchase trees. (We may propose a short statement on our County-Rayonier agreements that could be repeated in a few places, rather than request too many edits within the document.)	Edit Proposed	Have not received clarification in writing from Rayonier, need direction from County on further edits
Clarification on Master Plan details, MOU commitment wording, shoreline block water rights.	Edit Proposed	Have not received clarification in writing from Rayonier, need direction from County on further edits

Forterra Comments		
The plan does a great job of facilitating adaptive management and accounts for Rayonier's ongoing timber harvests. Its also great to see the consultation with the Suquamish and Port Gamble S'Klallam noted as well as the balance of conservation, recreation, and cultural values. Of course, we defer to the Tribes in their review to ensure a good balance.	Comment Noted	Note, no edit
The only minor comment we can add to the discussion is in regards to perception management. While the entire plan more than adequately describes and illustrates the ongoing timber harvest activities by Rayonier, I think that can be emphasized a little more in the executive summary in front of the community effort to purchase some of the timber rights.	Edit Proposed	The Framework supports timber acquisition and that should be clear in the document. Kitsap and its community partners will work towards the acquisition of timber rights to avoid commercial harvest. This will require a combination of state and local funding as well as private fundraising to acquire key timbers stands surrounding environmental features and/or the STO trail.
I'm not minimizing our joint protection efforts; just noting that it's important to emphasize language that further educates the public about ongoing industrial timber use and make it even more clear in the exec summary that many will only read. This is a topic all of us have discussed in detail over the past year so I'm probably not saying anything new. I think we all rather exceed community expectations :)	Edit Proposed	Noted above
Emphasize the timber rights are retained by Rayonier, and without the purchase of timber rights, there will continue to be clearcutting throughout the park	Comment Noted	Discussed in executive summary, no edits recommended
Public perception management, need to identify that this is a "working forest"	Comment Noted	Note for future public engagement, no edits recommended
Ensure messaging is not exclusive to restoration - we have a long way to go before the park can operate as a natural preserve/conservation area	Edit Proposed	Add language in land conservation & restoration section intro, 1st paragraph after second to last sentence. The park will remain a working forest until all timber deeds are transferred to the county, and restoration efforts will need to continue for decades before the forest begins to transform into a healthy natural forest once again.

Need to also be sure to communicate that any potential purchase of rights is not a done deal	Edit Proposed	The Framework supports timber acquisition and that should be clear in the document. The efforts of Kitsap and the community in acquiring timber rights is dependent on accessing funding and the interest of the timber holder. Funding will be a challenge due to the cost of the remaining timber within the Park and there is no requirement for Rayonier to offer the trees for sale.
Need to highlight thinning activities and harvesting for cultural use	Edit Proposed	Add note in land conservation & restoration section that harvesting for cultural use will remain throughout the park in accordance with tribal agreements
Shoreline block and ride park are owned, but still require maintenance	Edit Proposed	Add note to restoration thinning section
Rayonier is tending to turnover trees after about 1 growing season	Comment Noted	Note, no edit
County and Forterra have engaged with Rayonier to explore opportunities	Comment Noted	Note, no edit
Regardless of older stands or newer planted areas after clearcutting, will still need to continue to actively thin for maintenance Will need to continue for decades as the trees mature	Edit Proposed	Add note to restoration thinning section
Emphasize that actual restoration will take a lot of effort over time	Edit Proposed	Noted above
County continues to collect data each year on the forest practices and replanted areas	Edit Proposed	Add note to Action 5 - monitor section
What is considered in the Forest Thinning Priority mapping? Is this assuming current conditions, which would be invalid upon being clear-cut?	Edit Proposed	Add note to clarify the intent of the priority mapping and note relationship to planned timber harvest
Does Anchor define what determines their "high" vs "very high" ratings?	Edit Proposed	Define in Action 1 - restoration thinning section

Accessibility Advisory Group Comments		
Note picture on pages ES-11 and 121	Edit Proposed	Change picture
Page 83, Trail Considerations Be sure to include "wheelchair users" within the context of who currently uses the trails	Edit Proposed	Add to section
Special paint to be used - can be detected by those with sight impairments Determined it might not be appropriate for STO, since there's defined edges and users can find with cane Consider to guide people where to go for certain facilities Would need to provide canes that work for this paint Would primarily be useful for events or other planned program uses	Comment Noted	Note for future planning, no edits recommended
Bike stand with tools for user use Cabled at station to prevent theft Consider locating with adaptive equipment facility	Comment Noted	Note for future planning, no edits recommended
From Marsha, working on getting grant funding for adaptive equipment procurement Currently looking at locating first at Clear Creek and in Port Orchard Currently not looking at anything with electric assist Limited by charging capability Intent is to store at locker with combination code to check out	Comment Noted	Note for future planning, no edits recommended
Would consider electric assist features if charging capabilities are potentially provided Consider bringing in power to adaptive equipment use building Note that intent is to have a park ranger/staff member on-site who can help check out and check on equipment	Comment Noted	Note for future infrastructure planning, no edits recommended

Consider working with Port Gamble town as well for other charging activities		
Consider power chair charging stations as well Would need to consider different chair chargers and adapters Consider locating near rest/picnic area(s)	Comment Noted	Note for future planning/programming, no edits recommended
Viewing platform is not currently accessible - would need to be improved	Edit Proposed	Add note in viewing areas/platforms to update existing areas to allow access by all park users
When making new trails, consider chair use and don't ADD barriers to use	Edit Proposed	Plan doesn't call for any new class 1 or 2 trails, consider language recommending any new class 3 trails be built with access needs in mind
Consider maintenance of old logging roads as well to improve accessibility of those trails	Edit Proposed	Add language recommending maintenance on class 3 and 4 trails to maintain access conditions for all users
Consider for signage, Don't like "Accessible" language Make the language for ALL users	Edit Proposed	Change language on page 162 from "accessible". This should be described to list barriers and access limitations to allow all park users to understand conditions of trail and make a determination if the trail is accessible to their needs. Change "ADA Accessible" to "Accessible for All Park Users" on pages 86 and 160, ensure no other language style is used. No further edits recommended
Challenge in making a simple classification to be included in blade signs, since different chairs (manual/powered) would be different Also, grade is difficult to understand for many users	Comment Noted	Note for future planning. Recommend just elaborating on the type of information to be relayed on directional signs as noted above, consider using grade, side slope, trail conditions as examples for consideration.
Consider vision impairment suggestions Consider with any ongoing advisory efforts Consider there's already an accessible communities advisory committee Consider that some folks are not on that committee - may want to remain consulting to county Consider auditory devices	Edit Proposed	Add note recommending further collaboration with advisory groups in future planning activities in introduction Other notes for future planning, no edits recommended

Note walkway along highway in Bayview Phase 2 graphic	Edit Proposed	Add arrow and "Potential Sidewalk" along eastern side of SR104 - also recommended by WSDOT
Consider drinking fountains throughout park	Edit Proposed	Add to infrastructure

Educational Program Advisory Group Comments		
<p>Concern with proximity of nursery to trails/active recreation</p> <p>Consider fencing to prevent park users from damaging plants</p> <p>For research projects, there's a definite concern with recreation impact</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Note for future planning, may reconsider alignment of new class 3 trail to provide greater separation. All future development proposals will be reviewed for potential conflicts and any impacts minimized through mitigation measures.</p> <p>Add language to phase 2 recommending fencing around native plant nursery to preserve sensitive plants</p>
<p>Want to ensure forestry practices and forest restoration is included in the interpretive program</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Add to Interpretive signage description</p>
<p>Consider the phasing of the picnic structures</p>	<p>Edit Proposed</p>	<p>Recommend changing phase of Picnic shelter specifically for education center support to Phase 1</p>

Emergency Services Advisory Group Comments		
Knox boxes would be keyed by Fire District Consider a keypad knox box Rick will look into preferred Knox Box model/style	Comment Noted	Note for future planning, no edit
Need to determine gate style Will STO gates be a parks standard or public works standard Need to consider other access needs like DNR and Rayonier Will need to coordinate with Rayonier for gates outside of park boundaries	Comment Noted	Note for future design standards, no edit
Want to ensure that yurt style glamping facilities are as close to vehicle access as possible Consider a fire road spur extending beyond the maintenance yard Fire hydrant(s) in camping area	Edit Proposed	Add note that placement is approximate based on environmental evaluation, and emergency vehicle access will need to be evaluated in design if project proceeds. Verify distance from pavement of maintenance yard and parking to furthest perimeter of camping outline, evaluate if a spur should be added in phase 2 or 3.
Identify event staging area for emergency helicopter use	Edit Proposed	Add note to plans



PORT GAMBLE FOREST HERITAGE PARK FRAMEWORK FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS (FAQ)

General

Why does the Framework consider the Mountain Biking Ride Park, Sound to Olympics (STO) Trail, and Stottlemeyer Trailhead as given elements of the Parks future?

The Framework only acknowledged these three Park elements, it did not create them. The 3500-acre Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park (PGFHP) acquisition required years of dedication from multiple community groups and interests. This included conservationists, hikers, bike and horseback riders, and walkers. Each saw a wonderful opportunity for the community as a whole but also for their specific interests.

From the outset of the acquisition campaign in 2010, the Parks future showed opportunities for each interest to have a presence in the Park. This included a Mountain Bike Ride Park in the NW corner, a regional, paved, shared-use path (Sound to Olympics Trail) through the Park, and trailheads to improve parking and access to the many areas, including Stottlemeyer Road. All grant applications, agency negotiations, and advocacy from local and state elected officials included the messaging of these specific opportunities if our acquisition was successful.

Kitsap is dedicated to meeting these commitments to acknowledge the years of efforts of so many to make the Park possible.

When was it determined the Sound to Olympics Trail (STO) would run through the Park?

The STO alignment through the Park was considered from the outset of the acquisition campaign in 2010. It was further memorialized with the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facility Plan in 2013. Both documents included expansive public outreach to Kitsap residents, community groups, and organizations. Both Plans received nearly unanimous support at their adoptions. Since then, the STO alignment has been acknowledged in acquisition documents, stewardship plans, and feasibility studies. Kitsap has dedicated hundreds of thousands of dollars to planning, designing, and constructing the multi-million-dollar public investment. The Framework only acknowledges these historic commitments, it does not create them.

Timber Harvest

Why does the Framework discuss cutting trees?

In acquiring large portions of the Park, Kitsap County was limited in funding and only acquired the land to protect it from future development. The timber, more than 60% of the overall property's value, was left with Rayonier to harvest one last time. They must conclude these harvests by 2042. As areas are harvested, Kitsap County takes full ownership and can begin restoring the site to a mature natural forest. This does not apply to the Shoreline Block or the Ride Park, which the County owns both land and timber.

The Framework reflects this obligation but proposes priorities for future timber acquisition if funding becomes available, and Rayonier is willing to sell specific stands.

Doesn't the Framework want to preserve existing tree stands in the Park?

The Framework proposes to restore the vast majority of the Park (93.3%) to long-term, natural, mature forests. The Framework proposes continued efforts to acquire timber stands from Rayonier between now and the conclusion of their timber rights (2042). Kitsap, conservation groups, and community partners are currently working to raise money to preserve several key tree stands around wetlands and streams, the Sound to Olympics Trail alignment, and other mature areas. This acquisition will require a combination of state and local funding and private fundraising to make it a reality.

Are there areas where the County owns the trees, where there may be future logging?

Many of the timber stands in the Park need management to ensure their long-term health. Rayonier planted and managed many stands for commercial harvest. This growing strategy often plants trees close together, providing for little understory and limited wildlife habitat benefit. To ensure the long-term viability of these stands and protect them from disease, some selective harvesting is necessary over time. These harvests provide space for trees to grow fully and the expansion of ground vegetation. Such environmentally-sensitive thinnings are directed by the Kitsap County Forest Stewardship Plan, which has been used successfully countywide. For more information regarding this Forest Stewardship Plan, please visit <https://www.kitsapgov.com/parks/Pages/ForestStewardship.aspx>.

Public Participation

How did the Framework process engage the community?

The Framework public engagement process was planned as a multi-level process that included a core Steering Committee, Key Stakeholders, and Advisory Groups, as well as General Public Engagement. The intent of this was to develop as comprehensive a process as possible within the limited budget constraints of the Framework project. A project website was established two weeks before the first public meeting at the beginning of the Visioning and Programming phase. The project website was updated with each phase of the project with project information, recordings of public meetings, and project documents. Four scheduled public meetings occurred at each phase. Due to the concern with Conservation and Restoration, an additional public panel session specifically on these goals was established early in the project. In-person and online surveys were conducted throughout the process to help inform the process. All public comments regarding the draft Framework document have been collected and individually reviewed against the document.

The Steering Committee consisted of three very active community members that acted as representatives of various partner organizations and met roughly every four weeks throughout the process. Key Stakeholders, including local Indigenous Tribes, Parks Advisory Board, Forterra, and Rayonier, were engaged at each phase of the process. Additionally, advisory groups were established to focus on specific goals of the Framework, including Accessibility, Education, and Ecological Restoration and Conservation, which were convened and consulted periodically throughout the process. Further targeted engagement with advisory partners and local agencies occurred periodically regarding other specific goals such as Forest Management, Equity and Inclusion, Emergency Services, Transportation, Specific Recreational Uses, and Economic Development.

The overall timeline of the process was extended by at least six months to provide additional time for public comment. In addition, the project team captured and reviewed any public input at PGFHP Stewardship Committee Meetings, Parks Advisory Board Meetings, and BoCC Meetings.

Why was the outreach process focused on virtual events and electronic methods?

The Framework was funded by the Kitsap Public Facilities District with a specific schedule for completion by Summer 2022. The schedule coincided with the COVID-19 pandemic and its limitations and, at times, prohibitions for public gatherings. Kitsap followed all guidelines for the protection of our citizens and staff.

To meet the schedule, Kitsap and its consultants employed a broad range of virtual and electronic methods of public outreach (see question above).

Will there be future public discussions before the Framework's proposals are implemented?

The Framework is only a guidance document to be used as a reference in future discussions of Park activities. Other than the long-standing Mountain Biking Ride Park, STO, and Stottlemeyer Trailhead, it is the first step toward discussions of new recreation and education uses in the Park. Creation of new uses and facilities are complex, and costly facilities will require key partnerships with private businesses, organizations, and groups. These will require additional public discussions to help establish a combination of uses, programming, scope, and scale. These conversations would then lead to formal permitting with additional design details and environmental assessments for public review.

How has the current timber owner (Rayonier/OPG) participated in the Framework development?

Rayonier owns the timber on a significant portion of the Park and has several access rights to harvest the trees through 2042. Kitsap has coordinated the Park's future plans with those activities. Rayonier participated as a stakeholder providing insights into their development plans for the adjacent town site and their forestry activities. Their participation was also important to ensure regional trail connections to the north and south of the Park.

During the Framework development process, Kitsap and Rayonier also agreed to a collaboration agreement that expanded regional trail connections. They provided Kitsap land for park amenities in Port Gamble, the Divide, and Hansville. While related, this agreement was independent of the Framework development. In this agreement, Rayonier provided \$75,000 to Kitsap County related to the maintenance of the wetlands, open space, and wildlife habitat south of Port Gamble and north of the Park, which will be deeded to Kitsap. This funding will be used to replace culverts and maintain trails through this area while ensuring its environmental protection into the future.

How have the Tribes participated in the Framework development?

Kitsap has coordinated closely with the Suquamish and Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribes through separate government-to-government discussions as well as invitations to all public meetings. At multiple points of the process, the staff and consultant team presented materials to the Tribes for review and comment. Most recently, Kitsap discussed the draft plan and received verbal comments from the Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribal Council for consideration (included in Comments Matrix). Kitsap is awaiting any additional written comments for consideration at the July 11 public hearing.

Framework Application

How “set in stone” are the proposals included in the Framework?

The Framework is strictly a guidance document to be used as a reference in future discussion at the Comprehensive Plan and Parks Recreation and Open Space Plan level. It is not a guaranteed future outcome. While the Framework provides significant analysis of the proposed uses, conservation strategies, and recreation opportunities, their implementation (if at all) is entirely flexible. Particularly, future discussions will determine much of the active recreation and education areas, ensuring adequate funding, partnerships, and support.

Why doesn't the Framework include greater detail regarding proposed uses and impacts?

As the Framework only guides potential opportunities for the Park, additional detail is unknown and dependent on future discussions with partners, the public, and funders. Furthermore, further detail would be deceptive as the scope and scale of any new uses have not to be determined outside the Mountain Biking Ride Park, Sound to Olympics Trail, and Stottlemeyer Trailhead.

Why isn't there a SEPA determination on the Framework?

As a guidance document, the Framework does not direct future action nor function as a step in an approval process, permit, policy, or otherwise. Future efforts towards the recreational and education components of the Framework will require planning level SEPA review once incorporated in the Comprehensive Plan, Parks Recreation, and Open Space Plan or similar document.

The Park projects that predated the beginning of Framework development had previously received planning-level SEPA review. The Mountain Biking Ride Park and Stottlemeyer Trailhead are allowed uses in the Parks zone. Their potential impacts (at a planning level) were determined when they received this zoning. The Sound to Olympics Trail (STO) was considered with the adoption of the North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan in 2011 and the Non-Motorized Facility Plan in 2013. Again, these impacts were assessed at a planning level. Additional project-level SEPA review is required when project permits are submitted. This level of review covers specific traffic and other impacts based on known trip generation and other metrics. Such permits are currently in review for the Mountain Biking Ride Park and Stottlemeyer Trailheads. They will be required for the construction of the STO segments in the future.

What future approvals will be necessary before elements of the Framework are implemented?

Depending on the proposed uses and their size and scale, additional land use, site development activity, and building may be required before any new recreational and educational uses are approved. At this level of detail, project-level SEPA will be conducted to determine traffic and environmental impacts. Such permits must meet all County Codes, including stormwater, critical areas, zoning, building, and fire, amongst others.

How does the Framework consider wetlands, streams, and other environmental features?

The Framework uses all known, existing information regarding environmental features, including wetlands, streams, flood plains, aquifer recharge areas, steep slopes, forest stands, and wildlife habitats, amongst others. The [Framework appendix](#) combined these various data sources to develop a site suitability index. This index was used to propose areas best for new recreational or education uses, such as those that are currently cleared, away from environmental features, and close to existing or planned road systems.

Conservation

How much of the Park is being preserved for conservation and passive recreation (timber stands and soft surface trails)?

The Framework proposes more than 93% of the 3,500-acre Park be dedicated to open space, conservation, and passive recreation. The remaining acreage (less than 7%) is focused primarily on long-term commitments such as the Mountain Biking Ride Park, Sound to Olympics Trail, and the Stottlemeyer Trailhead. The Framework proposes only 40 acres of new recreation and education uses and trailheads.

How does the Framework direct areas to be preserved or restored?

The Framework used natural systems, environmental features, existing mature timber stands, existing trail systems, and historic commitments (Mountain Biking Ride Park and Sound to Olympics Trail) to establish its conservation priorities. Active recreation and other significant activities are to be limited in these areas. While Rayonier has retained existing timber rights throughout a majority of the Park, Kitsap is working to raise funding for the acquisition of many of these stands and manage these lands accordingly. The Framework process heavily referenced the 2016 Stewardship Plan for PGFHP and existing environmental and geographic data, with recommendations to update the Stewardship Plan and develop a more comprehensive conservation and restoration planning effort in Phase 1, pending further funding.

Trails and Recreation

Why is the Sound to Olympics Trail (STO) being proposed to be paved?

The Park was acquired for all residents and visitors to Kitsap. While not all the Park will be accessible to all people, the Framework includes opportunities for those of all abilities and those with access needs. Soft surfaces (e.g., gravel and dirt) create impediments for wheelchairs (powered or manual), cane use, walkers, and other mobility aids can struggle with these surfaces, especially in times of rainfall common in the Pacific Northwest. The paved surface allows for a safe and stable means for all visitors to experience the beauty of portions of the Park.

Additionally, the STO is meant for commuters as well as recreators. The Trail is a safer option than SR307 and SR104 for bicyclists and will be constructed using funding dedicated to our transportation system. This requires paving in nearly all cases. Without access to these funds, construction of this accessible trail will not be possible due to its cost.

Why are there so many trails in the Park?

Before Kitsap's acquisition, the property had a substantial system of trails and logging roads extensively used by the public. These trails were predominantly designed for access for timber commercial timber operations. The Framework proposed to maintain many of these trails but has evaluated the system to address safety, environmental, and habitat concerns. Ultimately, the Framework proposes a net reduction in trail miles.

As the Park is 3500 acres in size, the Framework prioritizes the development and maintenance of trails that serve smaller loops to allow access to multiple user groups and audiences. This will require decommissioning

several trails and constructing new ones. But, again, the Framework proposed a future with fewer total trails in the Park.

Does the Framework establish single-use trails (e.g., only hikers, bikers, horseback riders)?

The Framework proposes a few single-use trails, such as the Mountain Biking Ride Park and some hiker-only trail segments. The focus on multi-use trails is to limit the number of trails in the Park to maintain wildlife habitat, reduce ongoing maintenance expenses and avoid creating expectations of unenforceable rules.

Signage will be installed to explain the purpose of these trails as well as emphasize the “good user” behaviors Kitsap expects in its Parks countywide.

Funding

Many of these proposals are expensive to construct and maintain? How will these efforts be funded, and will it pull funding from other County parks?

The sheer size of the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park leads to a different management strategy than other Heritage Parks. Many of the same methods, park coordinators, and stewardship groups play a crucial role but cannot be expected to manage 3,500 acres of diverse Park uses. Strategic partnerships will be necessary if the recreational and educational uses are expanded into the Park. Examples of such partnerships include the one between Evergreen Mountain Bike Alliance and Kitsap for the Mountain Biking Ride Park maintenance.

Public/private partnerships may be promoted for the camping areas, concessionaires, or other recreation facilities. Education facilities will need to be overseen by educational institutions at the local district or university/college level. All of these agreements would be addressed upfront at the planning stage to ensure long-term success.

Construction of such facilities will need funding from economic development organizations like the Kitsap Public Facilities District (KPFDD), the Economic Development District (EDD), and state and federal grants.

Even with these partnerships and funding streams, other local sources may need to be developed. For example, user fees for recreation facilities and creating a metropolitan parks district similar to the one that oversees the Kingston Community Center may be explored. The Framework includes a strong list of options that, again, would need to be determined early in the planning stages for any expansions of new uses within the Park.