

Appendix C – EIS Scoping Technical Memo



Environmental Solutions

Adolfson Associates, Inc.
5309 Shilshole Avenue NW, Suite
200
Seattle, WA 98107

FINAL TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 19, 2005

FROM: Denise E. Lathrop, AICP

TO: Brad Medrud, AHBL
James Weaver, Kitsap County
Joanne Woods-Long, City of Port Orchard

VIA:

SUBJECT: Recommended EIS Elements and Approach

PROJECT: Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan/EIS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to recommend which elements of the environment should be analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan following public input during the EIS scoping process. The elements of the environment that were identified based on the initial scope of work developed for this project adequately capture the elements of the environment identified by the public during the EIS scoping period. The project proposal is to resume EIS analysis of: Land Use/Population/Housing, Earth, Water Resources, Fish, Plants and Animals, Energy, Environmental Health (including Air and Noise), Transportation, and Public Services and Utilities. Comments on the four alternatives available during the EIS Scoping period helped to refine the alternatives for impact analysis in the EIS.

Summary of EIS Scoping

In accordance with the State Environmental Policy Action (SEPA), a scoping period for the Programmatic EIS on the Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan was

conducted from August 1, 2005 to August 31, 2005. Comments on alternatives, potential environmental impacts and mitigation were requested.

An open house was held on August 17, 2005 to provide an opportunity for interested citizens to obtain information on the integrated sub-area planning/SEPA process, to ask questions of staff and the consultant team working on the project, and to provide input on the scope of the EIS. Large maps and flip charts were also available for the public to record their comments. Representatives of the City of Port Orchard, Kitsap County, the EIS consultant team, Citizens Advisory Group, and the public attended the open house. No invited agencies or elected officials attended the meeting.

During the open house, members of the public questioned staff and consultants about:

- Extent of the study area
- Details of the alternatives
- Preferences about alternatives
- Growth forecast
- Long Lake watershed and salmon habitat
- Provision of water and sewer service to UGA
- Need buffer areas between industrial uses and residential areas
- Time-line for completing the draft EIS

A total of 118 comment forms, letters and e-mails were received during the scoping period and another 60 comments were recorded on the large maps and flip charts at the open house. The open house / EIS scoping comments covered a wide range of topics related to the environment as well as land use and other issues specific to each of the alternatives. Table 1 is a categorical listing of all of the comments by each of the identified elements of the environment as well as economic development. Several comments relate to multiple topics and they are listed in each category that applies. The first category of Table 1 lists comments related to the land use alternatives displayed at the open house and on the County's web site. In some cases the comments are specific to an individual alternative; in others the alternative was not indicated or the comment could apply to any or all of them.

The scoping comment form also asked participants to indicate if they had a preference by ranking the alternatives. It is important to note that while the preference information is useful, particularly in the context of the comments on individual alternatives, this is not a statistically valid survey; it simply reflects the opinion of the 64 people that returned comment forms indicating their preferences. A tabulation of the Land Use Alternative preferences follows:

Land Use Alternative Preferences Port Orchard / South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan/EIS Open House and Scoping Comments Received by August 31, 2005*				
	Land Use Alternative 1	Land Use Alternative 2	Land Use Alternative 3	Land Use Alternative 4
Survey Respondents Preference*				
First	13	33	15	8
Second	3	18	35	8
Third	3	7	7	41
Fourth	48	5	3	6

* Please note that the table reflects the preferences indicated on comment forms received during the EIS scoping period that ended August 31st, 2005, and that not all respondents indicated a land use alternative preference in their comments.

Table 1. Summary of Written Comments

Issue	Comments	Number of Comments Received
<p>Alternatives</p>	<p>See summaries by element of the environment below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Would like Project Team to postulate an alternative based on Kitsap County’s adoption of the high range population forecast which justifies larger UGA; 2. Commercial should only be for properties fronting Sydney RD SW (reference to school and pastoral area along SE Cedarast RD E) (Alternative 2); 3. Consider appropriateness of Industrial designation on SW Cook RD adjacent to residential development – access, safety, steep slopes, and environment (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4); 4. Preserve farms (avoid expansion into farming areas); 5. Question need of too much expansion of residential in areas east of Hwy 16 and past Bielmeier RD (Alternative 2); 6. Too much Urban Medium near Long Lake, change to Urban Low (Alternative 4); 7. UGA expansion/contraction -- Enlarge UGA (3 times); doesn't allow growth to be concentrated in urban areas; property outside UGA would develop (Alternative 1); Add area between Bethel Burley, Cashmere and Hwy 16 - to UGA (Alternative 2); Opposes extension of UGA near Long Lake due to sensitive nature of basin ecosystem/drainage (Alternative 2 – put boundary at Phillips not east of it); Alternative 3 – south of Mile Hill DR, west of Long Lake RD); opposes expansion area w/ of Glenwood RD SE (Alternative 2); delete extension to Beach DR E (Alternatives 2 and 3); add upper Beach DR area (Alternatives 2, 3, 4); go further south of Bielmeier (Alternative 2); 8. Preserve forests, parks and green space; 9. More consideration regarding where industrial areas are located (Clifton RD and SW Cook RD) (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4); remove from Berry Lake and Anderson Hill areas (Alternatives 2 and 3); 10. Preserve/provide for parks, greenbelts, and wildlife corridors - to prevent deer bear and cougar from getting trapped in developed areas; open space (Alternative 4); buffer for wildlife; 11. Provide for industrial growth and family wage jobs; place residential uses near industrial areas to reduce commute distance (Alternatives 2 and 3); 12. Area between Bethel Burley, Cashmere and Hwy 16 - to UGA (Alt 2) – recommended areas for designating 	<p>55</p>

Issue	Comments	Number of Comments Received
	Urban Low and Industrial; 13. Add commercial in Clifton RD area (Alternative 4); 14. Critical areas in NE – Designate Urban Reserve vs. 5-9 Dwelling Units/Acre (Alternative 4); Phillips RD high density conflicts with Jabone and Long Lake (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4); no high density on Long Lake (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4); retain rural protection on Sidney; 15. Need transition area (between Area 6 – Urban Low and Highway Tourist Commercial?) (Alternative 2); 16. Extend UGA LU boundary along Beach Drive north to Light House Point (both sides) Area is already sewered and served with public water (Alternative 2); 17. Extend UGA LU boundary along Beach Drive north to Light House Point (both sides) Area is already sewered and served with public water (Alternative 2); and 18. Area north of SE Mile Hill DR – keep rural, Urban Low (Alternative 2); keep out of UGA.	
Land Use/Population/Housing		
	Commercial should only be for properties fronting Sydney RD SW (reference to school and pastoral area along SE Cedarast RD E) (Alternative 2).	1
	Would like Project Team to postulate an alternative based on Kitsap County’s adoption of the high range population forecast which justifies larger UGA.	1
	Provisions/solutions for affordable housing.	3
	Consider appropriateness of Industrial designation on SW Cook RD adjacent to residential development – access, safety, steep slopes, and environment (Alternatives 2, 3 and 4).	8
	Providing housing close to employment, shopping, schools and medical facilities.	1
	Reaching mutual goals of balancing economic development and growth with Tribal commitment to protected salmon, shellfish, and other habitat supporting treaty resources.	1
	Redesignate Anderson Hill/Berry Lake RD triangle from urban reserve to rural.	1
	Consider reclassifying land use in Mile Hill DR/Woods RD area to support existing commercial uses, recent highway improvements and proposed improvements on Mile Hill DR.	1
	Lights from new development.	1
	Preserve farms (e.g., avoid expansion into farming areas).	3
	Question need of too much expansion of residential in areas east of Hwy 16 and past Bielmeier RD (Alternative 2).	1
	Too much Urban Medium near Long Lake, change to Urban Low; retain rural protection on Sidney (Alternative 4).	1

Issue	Comments	Number of Comments Received
	UGA expansion/contraction -- Enlarge UGA (3 times); doesn't allow growth to be concentrated in urban areas; property outside UGA would develop (Alternative 1); Add area between Bethel Burley, Cashmere and Hwy 16 - to UGA (Alternative 2); Opposes extension of UGA near Long Lake due to sensitive nature of basin ecosystem/drainage (Alternative 2 – put boundary at Phillips not east of it); Alternative 3 – south of Mile Hill DR, west of Long Lake RD); opposes expansion area w/ of Glenwood RD SE (Alternative 2); delete extension to Beach DR E (Alternatives 2 and 3); add upper Beach DR area (Alternatives 2, 3, 4); go further south of Bielmeier (Alternative 2).	20
	Percentage of existing vacancies in strip malls too great to warrant expansion of retail/commercial.	1
	Preserve forests, parks and green space.	1
	Minimize urban sprawl -- further the use of existing areas before spreading out.	1
	More consideration regarding where industrial areas are located (Clifton RD and SW Cook RD) (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4); remove from Berry Lake and Anderson Hill areas (Alternatives 2 and 3).	2
	Avoid buildable land shortage that artificially inflates affordable housing.	1
	Preserve/provide for parks, greenbelts, and wildlife corridors - to prevent deer bear and cougar from getting trapped in developed areas; open space (Alternative 4); buffer for wildlife – Phillips RD high density conflicts with Jabone and Long Lake (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4).	5
	Provide biking and horseback riding trails through urban and suburban areas.	1
	Consider new concepts of low impact development (e.g., cluster housing); environmentally and socially healthy economic development (e.g., development should preserve trees around houses).	3
	Increase residential designation around Port Orchard industrial area so people can live close to jobs – reduces traffic congestion and fuel consumption and air pollution.	1
	Provide for industrial growth and family wage jobs; place residential uses near industrial areas to reduce commute distance (Alternatives 2 and 3).	1
	Designation of commercial relative to transportation access in the Sedgwick RD area, traffic through residential areas and (Sedgwick area), and WSDOT plans to expand the lanes on Hwy 16 to Bethel (not accessible from freeway).	2
	Area between Bethel Burley, Cashmere and Hwy 16 - to UGA (Alt 2) – recommended areas for designating Urban Low and Industrial.	5
	Add commercial in Clifton RD area (Alternative 4).	1

Issue	Comments	Number of Comments Received
	Commercial development pattern: Centers/Corridors.	1
	Critical areas in NE – Designate Urban Reserve vs. 5-9 Dwelling Units/Acre (Alternative 4); Phillips RD high density conflicts with Jabone and Long Lake (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4); no high density on Long Lake (Alternatives 2, 3, and 4); retain rural protection on Sidney; don't develop Area 11 – steep slopes.	5
	Need transition area (between Area 6 – Urban Low and Highway Tourist Commercial?) (Alternative 2).	1
	Housing.	1
	Extend UGA LU boundary along Beach Drive north to Light House Point (both sides) Area is already sewered and served with public water (Alternative 2).	2
	Area north of SE Mile Hill DR – keep rural, Urban Low (Alternative 2); keep out of UGA.	3
Earth		
	Impact of logging and development on unstable slopes along Beach DR (Alternatives 2 and 4).	2
	Compatibility of industrial area on Cook RD in area characterized by steep slopes and ravines.	3
	Impacts from landslides/disasters.	1
Water Resources		
	Contamination of wells, beaches, waterways, rivers and streams.	1
	Development pressure on creeks.	1
	Surface water runoff.	2
	Groundwater.	1
	Water resources.	1
	Industrial designation on SW Cook RD and resulting surface water runoff from Cook RD into adjacent marsh.	2
	Increased pollution in polluted creeks in the area (Karcher Ck and Sacco Ck) (Alternatives 2 and 4).	1
	Concern with changing area south of Sedgewick Road from urban reserve to urban low – increased surface water runoff and impact to wells.	1
	Drainage impacts to Long Lake and Salmonberry Creek; vicinity of Glenwood RD SE (Alternative 2).	3
	Wetlands (vicinity of 3825/3813 Franway Ln SW).	2

Issue	Comments	Number of Comments Received
Fish, Plants and Animals		
	Potential loss of eco-systems and wildlife.	1
	Eagle habitat along Beach DR (also habitat for river otters, seals, deer, great blue heron, Canadian geese, surf scoters and kingfishers); heron and eagle habitat west of Glenwood RD SE (Alternative 2).	2
	Importance of Long Lake basin/Salmonberry Creek ecosystem -- includes Salmonberry Ck and aquifer, wetlands, springs, wildlife habitat and corridor (Alt 3).	2
	Compatibility of industrial area on Cook RD in area with potential blue heron and bald eagle habitat (near 1503 and 1497 SW Cook RD).	1
	Reestablish salmon spawning habitat in unnamed creek that comes out at ____ Orchard.	1
	Preservation of trees/forests, ponds and wildlife habitat preservation of trails.	1
	Displacement of wildlife.	
	Critical areas SW Berry Lake RD.	1
	Impacts to small creek near their property.	1
Energy		
	Energy.	1
Environmental Health		
	Noise.	2
	Air quality.	1
	Public health risk at Long Lake.	1
Transportation		
	Planning proper roads and infrastructure to support growth.	3
	Increase in traffic and congestion.	4
	Road ingress/egress/access to support growth.	3
	Traffic impacts on Mile Hill DR and Bay/Beach DR.	1
	Contribution of land use distribution in NE Port Orchard and consideration for transportation access and roads.	1
	Capacity of roads.	1
	Alternatives 2 and 3 straddle Hwy 16 -- traffic, access and additional traffic through residential areas to access commercial areas.	2
	Provisions for increased transit service to reduce traffic congestion.	1
	Transportation.	1

Issue	Comments	Number of Comments Received
	Traffic needs/improvements to be addressed -- at Clifton and Anderson Hill; Sedgewick from Long Lake to Lake Flora RD; Bethel area from Hwy 16; and Clifton from Lloyd Parkway to Port Orchard BLVD; roadway extensions (Baby Doll RD, Mullenix RD).	11
	Safety issues associated industrial traffic (on steep roads) and residents and children from adjacent residential areas; don't develop Area 11 – steep slopes, traffic, accidents, and safety.	3
	Consider alternative transportation access for industrial traffic from Clifton RD to industrial area (Cook RD area) versus Anderson Hill RD.	1
	Industrial designation on Cook RD -- truck traffic on steep roads.	1
	Traffic and road improvements (Glenwood, Sedgewick and Sidney Roads).	2
	Pedestrian/bicycle safety (e.g., on roads w/ narrow shoulders used by pedestrians/bicycles).	2
	Road shoulders should be paved in areas designated residential and where residential surrounds commercial areas.	1
Public Services and Utilities		
	Planning proper and sufficient infrastructure to support growth.	3
	Sewer district/service boundary should be expanded (e.g., south of Bielmeier and Van Skiver).	2
	Community facility and utility service improvements/expansion.	3
	Capacity public services and utilities.	5
	Emergency services and public safety.	1
	New development must have stormwater retention areas.	1
	Who pays for expansion of sewer service?	1
	Need to sewer area around Long Lake.	1
	Area north of SE Mile Hill DR – minimize complex sewer systems, uphill from plant; Urban Low would provide better connection to Manchester.	3
Economics		
	Consider environmentally and socially healthy economic development.	2
	Planning needs to consider business needs.	1

ALTERNATIVES

Four alternatives were developed for public comment during EIS Scoping. All four alternatives were developed with the goal of accommodating the sub-area's projected population growth in the next 20 years. Differences between the alternatives center on the size of the UGA, location of the urban growth boundary and the intensity and location of land uses proposed. The comments received during the EIS Scoping process helped to refine the alternatives for impact analysis in the EIS.

EIS ELEMENTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Based on comments received during EIS scoping, no new environmental elements have been identified for analysis in the EIS; however, comments provide direction regarding where analysis should be focused for some elements.

The EIS will incorporate existing affected environment information, analyze potential impacts of the four proposed land use alternatives, and identify mitigation measures, cumulative impacts, and significant unavoidable adverse impacts for the following elements of the environment, which may be reorganized as the structure of the EIS is developed:

- **Land Use/Population/Housing:** The four proposed alternatives have been developed to accommodate the same population allocation/forecast developed for the Port Orchard South Kitsap Urban Growth Area. This information will be used for purposes of developing this Sub-Area Plan/EIS. The analysis, conducted by AHBL, will include the impacts of the land use alternatives on the distribution of population, housing and employment as well as identifying policy and land use changes that may be recommended for mitigation.
- **Earth:** AESI will analyze impacts of the alternatives on soils, steep slopes, and floodplains.
- **Water Resources:** The proposed alternatives will increase impervious cover in the area and require additional storm water detention and treatment. Adolphson will address potential storm water impacts to water resources and water quality associated with the various alternatives. Major issues may include appropriate drainage given soil conditions, compliance with County/City storm water detention and treatment requirements, and potential impacts to downstream discharge points (such as streams or shoreline). Potential impacts of development on Long Lake basin and Salmonberry Creek watershed will be evaluated as it relates to the land use alternatives. Work will include coordination with AESI regarding soils conditions and storm water design and compliance, as needed. AESI will analyze impacts to groundwater, aquifer recharge areas, and well heads.

- **Fish, Plants and Animals:** Because the study area is characterized by large undeveloped tracts, direct or indirect impacts to fisheries and wildlife habitat are probable. Adolfson will evaluate potential impacts to fisheries, especially salmon, wildlife species and evaluate the potential presence of threatened, endangered, candidate, and priority species or habitat. Adolfson biologists will conduct a windshield-level survey of the study area to identify fish and wildlife habitat, and possible wetlands. During field visits, we will confirm previous consultant's evaluations as well as those identified on County/City sources, areas identified by individuals during EIS scoping, and note others that may be possible.
- **Energy:** Use of energy and natural resources is directed by a number of regulations, policies and plans at the local, state, regional and national levels. These range from prescriptive energy codes to laws and planning policies for energy use in the Pacific Northwest to guidance and initiatives related to sustainable development and green building practices. Adolfson will evaluate the potential impacts to energy and natural resources that could result from implementing proposed plan alternatives.
- **Environmental Health:** Adolfson will identify potential environmental health risks associated with implementing the proposed plan alternatives based on existing documents. Possible areas of investigation include potential exposure to toxic chemicals, fire and explosion, noise, hazardous waste and airborne contaminants. Information from the transportation and air quality sections will also be evaluated as part of this qualitative analysis.
- **Transportation:** County staff will prepare a report that documents their analysis, findings, and recommendations related to transportation impacts. The items included in the existing conditions or alternatives sections of the Transportation Chapter are: intersection operations; traffic safety; transit; pedestrian and bicycles; planned street system; traffic forecasts; project trip generation; trip distribution and assignment; and mitigation measures.
- **Public Services and Utilities:** AHBL will analyze the impacts of the alternatives on existing and planned improvements of public/private water and sewer systems; parks, open space and recreational facilities; public safety facilities and levels of service (if defined by the County); and public school enrollment. No modeling of utility systems will be conducted.

MITIGATION

Although no specific comments were received on mitigation, a number of scoping comments such as those identifying infrastructure deficiencies will help to focus the discussion of potential mitigation measures.

Appendix D –Critical Area Data Sources

Mapping and GIS Data sources for critical area boundaries and geographic locations include the following:

- Kitsap County Department of Natural Resources documents,
- Kitsap County 2003 Salmonid Refugia Study,
- NRCS (SCS) 1973 Soil Survey,
- National Wetland Inventory,
- Kitsap County Area Hydric Soils List,
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources Hydrography,
- Coastal Zone Atlas,
- U.S. Geological Survey landslide hazard, seismic hazard, and volcano hazard maps,
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources seismic hazard maps for Western Washington,
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources slope stability maps,
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration tsunami hazard maps,
- Federal Emergency Management Administration flood insurance maps,
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Geologic Map, Liquefaction Susceptibility for the 7.5-minute Quadrangles, Washington,
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Priority Habitat and Species maps,
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources, Official Water Type Reference maps, as amended,
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources Puget Sound Intertidal Habitat Inventory maps;
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources Shorezone Inventory;
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program mapping data;
- Washington State Department of Health Annual Inventory of Shellfish Harvest Areas;
- Anadromous and resident salmonid distribution maps contained in the Habitat Limiting Factors reports published by the Washington Conservation Commission;
- Washington State Department of Natural Resources State Natural Area Preserves and Natural Resource Conservation Area maps; and
- Kitsap County official habitat maps.