

**10 YEAR UPDATE
KITSAP COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**



**VOLUME II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement
Supplemental Errata Sheet**

Listed below is a supplemental errata/correction sheet for Volume II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The supplemental errata sheet is in addition to the Volume I errata sheet presented on September 18, 2006 public hearing. Items noted below are intended to improve clarity and consistency between Volumes I through III, as well as provisions within the Growth Management Act (GMA).

No	Section / Chapter	Page No.	Proposed Correction/Revision	Comments
1.	Chapter 2. Alternatives	2-15	Second sentence of CPSGMHB bullet should say: Two <u>Three</u> if the most recent cases are summarized below.	Minor text clarification
2.	Appendix C. Methods	TAZ spreadsheet for Alternative 3	Provide correct Alternative 3 figures. The correct Alternative 3 population numbers are shown in Attachment A to this sheet, reflecting the numbers tested in the model for the DEIS.	As noted in Appendix C, rural wooded population was distributed based on one-mile rings around service areas. The detailed population numbers for Alternative 3 should reflect those tested in mid-June 2006 rather than earlier numbers since the “ring” centroid near Bremerton was slightly shifted. This shifted some rural population a little between neighboring TAZs, but did not affect total growth numbers nor figures for UGAs.

No	Section / Chapter	Page No.	Proposed Correction/Revision	Comments
3.	<p>Chapter 1. Summary, Section 1.8.6, Transportation</p> <p>Chapter 3. Affected Environments, Section 3.2.6, Transportation</p>	1-51, 3.2-246, 247 and 249	<p>Add an "X" next to Jackson Ave SE, in south county for Alternative 1. on Table 3.2-116. The cost would increase to \$215,184,000 under Alternative 1 in Table 3.2-118 and in Table 3.2-121 (range would be \$205,910,000 to \$215,184,000). The revenue shortfall on Table 3.2-121 would then equal \$186,358,868 (range of \$177,084,868-\$186,358,868).</p> <p>The cost would increase to \$310,635,000 under Alternative 2 in Table 3.2-118 and in Table 3.2-121 (range now would be \$301,361,000 to \$310,635,000). The revenue shortfall on Table 3.2-121 would then equal -\$281,809,868 (range of \$272,535,868-\$281,809,868).</p> <p>Corresponding edits would be made to page 1-51 in the summary that summarizes costs and revenues.</p>	<p>The Jackson Avenue SE project in South County was identified in the impact analysis (see Figures 3.2-17 and 18) as needing improvement under Alternatives 1 and 2 similar to Alternative 3, but the "X" on Table 3.2-116 was omitted under Alternatives 1 and 2 and also omitted under corresponding tables with costs/revenue. The level of improvement may be less than under Alternative 3; therefore, the cost estimate is shown as a range.</p>