

Final Environmental Impact Statement  
for

# Kitsap County 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

April 2016



kitsap2036  
*Growing for a Better Tomorrow*





April 29, 2016

Dear Reader:

Attached is a copy of the Kitsap County Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS) for the Comprehensive Plan Update 2016-2036, prepared in accordance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

The proposal is to update the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA). Through the Comprehensive Plan Update, the County is: reestablishing its vision; addressing growth targets of 77,071 new people and 46,647 new jobs countywide between 2012 and 2036; updating its inventory of natural and built environment conditions; streamlining and setting goals and policies; updating its land use plan; amending zoning, critical areas and other development regulations; and aligning its Capital Facilities Plan to address Kitsap County's future. The proposal and associated Final SEIS address properties located within unincorporated Kitsap County.

This SEIS for the Comprehensive Plan Update 2016 supplements the following EISs:

- Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update – Integrated Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: Final EIS, December 2006.
- Kitsap County Urban Growth Area (UGA) Sizing and Composition Remand, Final SEIS, August 10, 2012.
- City of Bremerton and Kitsap County, Gorst Creek Watershed Characterization & Framework Plan, Gorst Subarea Plan, and Gorst Planned Action EIS, October 8, 2013.

The alternatives under consideration include a No Action Alternative assuming the continuation of the pre-update Comprehensive Plan, Alternatives 2 and 3, and a Preferred Alternative that test different growth and land use patterns.

**Alternative 1 No Action:** Alternative 1 would maintain the pre-update Comprehensive Plan with no land use plan, policy, or development regulation changes; it is a required alternative under SEPA.

**Alternative 2 Whole Community:** Alternative 2 directs the 20-year growth targets into compact UGA boundaries emphasizing mixed uses and higher densities in centers and corridors. All together Alternative 2 results in a 4% net reduction of UGA lands. Alternative 2 also updates the Comprehensive Plan and regulations based on GMA requirements and Board of County Commissioner's (BOCC) Guiding Principles.

**Alternative 3 All Inclusive:** Alternative 3 considers adjustments to the land use plan and several UGAs to address 20-year growth targets. All private reclassification requests would be included. Alternative 3 expands some UGAs and reduces others, and results in a 4% increase in UGA lands. The Comprehensive Plan and development regulations would be updated based on GMA requirements.

**The Preferred Alternative** was developed utilizing public input on the three Draft SEIS alternatives above, is similar to Alternative 2, and accommodates 20-year growth targets within smaller UGA boundaries emphasizing mixed uses and higher densities in centers and corridors. The Silverdale and Port Orchard UGAs are reduced. A small expansion of the Kingston UGA is included though less in area than Alternative 3. Some private reclassification requests are included. All together the Preferred Alternative results in a 1% net reduction of UGA lands. The Preferred Alternative also updates the Comprehensive Plan and regulations based on GMA requirements and BOCC Guiding Principles.

For a range of natural resource and built environment topics, the SEIS addresses potential impacts of the studied alternatives at a non-project, programmatic level of analysis addressing the following topics: Earth; Air Quality; Water Resources; Plants and Animals; Land and Shoreline Use; Plans and Policies; Population, Housing, and Employment; Transportation; and a range of Capital Facilities, Public Services, and Utilities.

A 30-day comment period was held for the Draft SEIS extending from November 6, 2015 to 5 p.m. December 7, 2015. Responses to comments on the Draft SEIS and clarifications and corrections are included in the Final SEIS. The Final SEIS also analyzes a Preferred Alternative. The Final SEIS should be read in conjunction with the Draft SEIS that it completes.

Kitsap County is preparing a Final Comprehensive Plan for legislative adoption and associated implementing development regulations. For information about public meetings associated with the proposal, please see the project website at: <http://compplan.kitsapgov.com>.

If you have any questions or desire clarification of the above information, please contact David Greetham, Planning Supervisor, Kitsap County Community Development, Dgreetha@co.kitsap.wa.us, (360) 337-4641.

Sincerely,



Scott Diener  
Manager, Development Services and Engineering  
SEPA Responsible Official  
Dept of Community Development

**FACT SHEET****PROJECT TITLE**

Kitsap County 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

**PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

Kitsap County (the County) is updating its Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) (RCW 36.70A), as part of the required 8-year review and evaluation. The County's 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update is also intended to achieve consistency with the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) VISION 2040, countywide planning policies (CPPs), and local community needs.

Through the Comprehensive Plan Update, the County is reestablishing its vision; addressing growth targets of 77,071 new people and 46,647 new jobs countywide between 2012 and 2036; updating its inventory of natural and built environment conditions; streamlining and setting goals and policies; updating its land use plan; amending zoning, critical areas and other development regulations; and aligning its Capital Facilities Plan to address Kitsap County's future.

The Comprehensive Plan Update 2016 proposal and above objectives are tested with four alternatives:

**Alternative 1 No Action:** Pre-update Comprehensive Plan as of September 2015. Alternative 1 would maintain the pre-update Comprehensive Plan with no land use plan, policy, or development regulation changes; it is a required alternative under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

**Alternative 2 Whole Community:** reflects Guiding Principles and GMA Directives. Alternative 2 directs the 20-year growth targets into compact Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries emphasizing mixed uses and higher densities in centers and corridors. Alternative 2 makes UGA adjustments in the Bremerton UGA – expansions in West Bremerton and reductions in East Bremerton for more efficient public services delivery. The Port Orchard UGA is also reduced. A small (<1%) expansion of Silverdale UGA is included in Alternative 2. Some private reclassification requests related to employment are included. All together Alternative 2 results in a 4% net reduction of UGA lands. Alternative 2 also updates the Comprehensive Plan and regulations based on GMA requirements and Board of County Commissioner's (BOCC) Guiding Principles described in Sections 1.4.1 and 2.2.2.

**Alternative 3 All Inclusive:** most changes; all reclassification requests. Alternative 3 considers adjustments to the land use plan and several UGAs to address 20-year growth targets. All private reclassification requests would be included. Areas of UGA expansion are considered in Kingston and Silverdale UGAs. Boundary reductions are considered in the Port Orchard UGA. Central Kitsap and Bremerton UGA boundaries would be expanded in some locations and reduced in others for a net increase. The net result of Alternative 3 is a 4% increase in

UGA lands. Last, the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations would be updated under Alternative 3, based on GMA requirements.

The **Preferred Alternative** was developed utilizing public input on the three Draft SEIS alternatives above, is similar to Alternative 2, and accommodates 20-year growth targets into smaller UGA boundaries emphasizing mixed uses and higher densities in centers and corridors. The Silverdale and Port Orchard UGAs are reduced. A small (7%) expansion of the Kingston UGA is included in the Preferred Alternative (75 acres of 1,145 acres) though less in area than Alternative 3 (total 1,212 acres). Some private reclassification requests are included. All together the Preferred Alternative results in a 1% net reduction of UGA lands. The Preferred Alternative also updates the Comprehensive Plan and regulations based on GMA requirements and BOCC Guiding Principles.

The Alternatives have similar growth levels though the pattern would be different as described above. The County is studying a growth range of 75,000 to 79,000 additional residents between 2012 and 2036, as well as 50,000 to 55,000 new jobs. Under all alternatives, nearly 80% of the new population would locate in cities and UGAs and over 90% of jobs would likewise locate in cities and UGAs.

These alternatives are detailed in Chapter 2 of this Final SEIS.

## LOCATION

The Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update 2016 addresses all unincorporated portions of Kitsap County, encompassing a total of approximately 319 square miles and a population of 171,940 persons (Washington State Office of Financial Management, 2015).

The incorporated cities of Bremerton, Port Orchard, Poulsbo, and Bainbridge Island are responsible for maintaining their own GMA comprehensive plans, which must be consistent with the County's Plan. The County's planning process, however, includes consultation and coordination with these jurisdictions. Additionally, the analysis considers cumulative growth across ecosystems such as climate and water resources or built systems such as transportation.

## PHASED ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

SEPA allows phased review where the sequence of a proposal is from a programmatic document, such as an EIS or SEIS addressing a comprehensive plan, to other documents that are narrower in scope, such as those prepared for site-specific, project-level analysis (WAC 197-11-060(5)). Kitsap County is using phased review in its environmental analysis of the Comprehensive Plan Update 2016 SEIS.

Additional environmental review will occur as other project or non-project actions are proposed to Kitsap County in the future. Phased environmental review may consider proposals that implement the Plan, such as land use regulations, specific development proposals, or other similar actions. Future environmental review could occur in the form of

Supplemental EISs, SEPA addenda, or determinations of non-significance. An agency may use previously prepared environmental documents to evaluate proposed actions, alternatives, or environmental impacts. The proposals may be the same as or different than those analyzed in the existing documents (WAC 197-11-600(2)).

## ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT SUPPLEMENTED

This SEIS for the Comprehensive Plan Update 2016 supplements the following EISs:

- Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update – Integrated Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: Final EIS, December 2006. The 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update Draft and Final EISs are herein incorporated by reference.
- Kitsap County Urban Growth Area (UGA) Sizing and Composition Remand, Final SEIS, August 10, 2012. The Remand Draft and Final SEISs are herein incorporated by reference.
- City of Bremerton and Kitsap County, Gorst Creek Watershed Characterization & Framework Plan, Gorst Subarea Plan, and Gorst Planned Action EIS, October 8, 2013. The Gorst Draft and Final EISs are herein incorporated by reference.

## PROPONENT

Kitsap County

## DATE OF IMPLEMENTATION

June 2016

## LEAD AGENCY

Kitsap County

## RESPONSIBLE SEPA OFFICIAL

Scott Diener, Manager  
 Development Services and Engineering  
 SEPA Responsible Official  
 614 Division Street, MS-36,  
 Port Orchard, Washington 98366-4682  
[sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us](mailto:sdiener@co.kitsap.wa.us)  
 (360) 337-5777

## CONTACT PERSON

David Greetham, Planning Supervisor  
 Kitsap County Community Development  
 Planning and Environmental Programs  
 614 Division Street MS-36  
 Port Orchard, WA 98366  
[Dgreetha@co.kitsap.wa.us](mailto:Dgreetha@co.kitsap.wa.us)  
 (360) 337-4641

## REQUIRED APPROVALS

Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Amendments and development regulations is subject to Planning Commission recommendations and Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) approval; review and comment by Washington State Department of Commerce as required by GMA; and Puget Sound Regional Council consultation and amendment review.

## PRINCIPAL EIS AUTHORS AND PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS

The SEIS has been prepared under the direction of Kitsap County's Community Development Department. Research, analysis, and document preparation were provided by the following firms or agencies:

### PRINCIPAL AUTHORS

BERK

2025 First Avenue, Suite 200

Seattle, WA 98121

Main (206) 324-8760

(Project Management, Land and Shoreline Use; Relationship to Plans and Policies; Population, Housing and Employment; Public Buildings; Fire Protection; Law Enforcement; Parks and Recreation; Schools; Solid Waste; Energy and Telecommunications; Library; Reasonable Measures Analysis – Draft SEIS Appendix G)

BHC

1601 Fifth Avenue Suite 500

Seattle, WA 98101

206.505.3400

(Sewer, Water, Stormwater)

Heffron Transportation

6544 NW 61st Street

Seattle, WA 98115

206-523-3939

(Transportation)

Landau Associates

601 Union Street, Suite 1606

Seattle, WA 98101

206-631-8680

(Earth and Air Quality)

The Watershed Company

750 Sixth Street South

Kirkland, WA 98033

(425) 822-5242

(Water resources, and plants and animals)



**CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS**

Kitsap County Community Development Department  
(Alternatives; Public Outreach; GIS)

Kitsap County Public Works Department  
(Traffic modeling)

**DATE OF DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ISSUANCE**

November 6, 2015

The Draft SEIS was the subject of a 30-day comment period from November 6, 2015 to December 7, 2015.

**DATE OF FINAL SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ISSUANCE**

April 29, 2016

**TYPE AND TIMING OF SUBSEQUENT ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

Subsequent phases of environmental review may consider proposals that implement the Comprehensive Plan, such as land use regulations, specific development proposals, or other similar actions. Future environmental review could occur in the form of Supplemental EISs (SEIS), SEPA addenda, or Determinations of Non-Significance.

**LOCATION OF BACKGROUND DATA**

Kitsap County Community Development Department. Comprehensive Plan Update website: <http://compplan.kitsapgov.com>.

**FINAL SEIS PURCHASE PRICE**

This Final SEIS is available for review at the Kitsap County Community Development Department, MS-36, 614 Division St, Port Orchard, WA 98366. The Final SEIS is posted on the County's website at <http://compplan.kitsapgov.com>.

CDs are available for purchase at Community Development Office - see address above (cost at the time of this writing is \$5.00).

## Distribution List

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS) distribution list includes the following who were provided a notice of availability or a compact disc:

Federal, Tribal, State Regional Governments	Cities and Counties	Water and Sewer Districts	Port Districts
Naval Base Kitsap	City of Bainbridge Island	Cities' water and sewer utilities (see at left)	Port of Bremerton
Point No Point Treaty Council	City of Bremerton	Crystal Springs Water District	Port of Brownsville
Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribe	City of Port Orchard	Kitsap Public Utility District (PUD)	Port of Elgon
Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	City of Poulsbo	Manchester Water	Port of Illahee
Puget Sound Regional Council	Jefferson County	North Perry Water	Port of Indianola
Puget Sound Partnership	Mason County	Northwest Water Systems	Port of Keyport
Puyallup Tribe	Pierce County	Old Bangor Water District	Port of Kingston
Skokomish Tribe		Rocky Point Water District	Port of Manchester
Squaxin Island Tribe	<b>School Districts</b>	Silverdale Water District #16	Port of Poulsbo
Suquamish Tribe	Bainbridge Island School District	Sunnyslope Water District	Port of Silverdale
Washington Department of Commerce, Growth Management Services	Bremerton School District	West Hills Water District	Port of Tracyton
Washington Department of Corrections	Central Kitsap School District	West Sound Utility District	
Washington Department of Ecology	North Kitsap School District		<b>Other</b>
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	South Kitsap School District		Bremerton Housing Authority
Washington Department of Health	North Mason School District	<b>Libraries</b>	Housing Kitsap
Washington Department of Natural Resources		Bainbridge Island Branch	Kitsap County Health District
Washington Department of Social and Health Services	<b>Fire Districts</b>	Bremerton Branch	Kitsap Economic Development Alliance
Washington Department of Transportation	Bainbridge Island Fire Department	Kingston Branch	Kitsap Historical Society
Washington Recreation and Conservation Office	Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue	Kitsap Regional Library, Main Branch	Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
Washington Parks and Recreation Commission	North Kitsap Fire and Rescue	Little Boston Branch	Olympic College
	Poulsbo Fire Department/Fire District 18	Manchester Branch	Power and Telecommunication Utilities
	South Kitsap Fire and Rescue	Port Orchard Branch	Village Green Metropolitan Park District
		Poulsbo Branch	
		Silverdale Branch	

Other notification will be provided in accordance with Kitsap County Code Chapter 18.04.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## COVER LETTER

## FACT SHEET

<b>Chapter 1. Summary</b> .....	<b>1-1</b>
1.1. Purpose of Proposed Action .....	1-1
1.2. State Environmental Policy Act Process .....	1-2
1.3. Public Involvement .....	1-2
1.4. Proposed Action, Alternatives, and Objectives .....	1-3
1.4.1. Objectives .....	1-3
1.4.2. Proposed Action and Alternatives .....	1-4
1.5. Major Issues, Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty, and Issues to be Resolved.....	1-5
1.6. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	1-6
1.6.1. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	1-6
1.6.2. Natural Environment .....	1-6
1.6.3. Built Environment: Land Use and Transportation.....	1-13
1.6.4. Built Environment: Public Services and Capital Facilities.....	1-19
<b>Chapter 2. Alternatives</b> .....	<b>2-1</b>
2.1. Introduction .....	2-1
2.2. Plan Update Proposal and Objectives.....	2-1
2.2.1. Proposal.....	2-1
2.2.2. Objectives .....	2-2
2.2.3. Alternatives .....	2-3
2.3. Description of the Plan Area .....	2-4
2.4. Purpose of this Supplemental EIS .....	2-6
2.5. SEPA Process .....	2-7
2.5.1. Public Review Opportunities .....	2-7
2.5.2. Level of Analysis .....	2-9
2.5.3. Phased Review .....	2-10
2.6. Development of Alternatives .....	2-11
2.6.1. Planning Process .....	2-11
2.6.2. Description of Preferred Alternative .....	2-25
2.6.3. Alternatives Overview .....	2-31
2.6.4. Previous and Future Alternatives .....	2-33
2.6.5. Benefits and Disadvantages of Delaying the Proposed Action...	2-34

<b>Chapter 3. Preferred Alternative Evaluation.....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1. Natural Environment .....	3-1
3.1.1. Earth .....	3-1
3.1.2. Air Quality .....	3-2
3.1.3. Water Resources (Surface and Ground).....	3-3
3.1.4. Plants and Animals .....	3-4
3.2. Built Environment: Land Use and Transportation.....	3-5
3.2.1. Land and Shoreline Use.....	3-5
3.2.2. Relationship to Plans and Policies .....	3-8
3.2.3. Population, Housing, and Employment .....	3-11
3.2.4. Transportation.....	3-13
3.3. Built Environment: Public Services and Utilities .....	3-20
3.3.1. Public Buildings.....	3-21
3.3.2. Fire Protection.....	3-23
3.3.3. Law Enforcement .....	3-28
3.3.4. Parks and Recreation.....	3-29
3.3.5. Schools .....	3-33
3.3.6. Solid Waste .....	3-37
3.3.7. Wastewater .....	3-37
3.3.8. Stormwater.....	3-39
3.3.9. Water Supply.....	3-41
3.3.10. Energy and Telecommunications.....	3-42
3.3.11. Library.....	3-42
 <b>Chapter 4. Reclassification Requests Resolution .....</b>	 <b>4-1</b>
 <b>Chapter 5. Clarifications and Corrections .....</b>	 <b>5-1</b>
5.1. Draft SEIS Chapter 1 Summary .....	5-1
5.2. Draft SEIS Chapter 2 Alternatives.....	5-2
5.3. Draft SEIS Chapter 3. Affected Environment, Significant Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.....	5-2
5.3.1. Draft SEIS Section 3.1 Natural Environment.....	5-2
5.3.2. Draft SEIS 3.2. Built Environment: Land Use and Transportation.....	5-3
5.3.3. Draft SEIS 3.3. Built Environment: Public Services and Utilities ..	5-7
5.4. Draft SEIS Chapter 4 Reclassification Requests .....	5-15
5.5. Draft SEIS Chapter 5 Acronyms, Abbreviations, and References.....	5-15
5.6. Draft SEIS Appendices .....	5-15
 <b>Chapter 6. Responses to Comments .....</b>	 <b>6-17</b>

6.1. Introduction .....	6-17
6.2. Responses to Comments.....	6-30

**Chapter 7. Acronyms, Abbreviations, and References..... 7-1**

7.1. Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	7-1
7.2. References.....	7-3

**LIST OF EXHIBITS**

Exhibit 2.3-1 Study Area Map .....	2-5
Exhibit 2.5-1 Let's Hear Kitsap.....	2-8
Exhibit 2.5-2 Community Quilt: What do you love about Kitsap?.....	2-9
Exhibit 2.6-1 Population Targets 2012-2036.....	2-12
Exhibit 2.6-2 Population Growth Target Shares: 2012-2036.....	2-12
Exhibit 2.6-3 Employment Targets 2012-2036.....	2-13
Exhibit 2.6-4 Employment Growth Shares: 2012-2036.....	2-13
Exhibit 2.6-5 Land Capacity Steps .....	2-14
Exhibit 2.6-6 Land Capacity Assumed Densities based on Platted Densities.....	2-14
Exhibit 2.6-7 Assumed Deductions in Land Capacity Analysis .....	2-14
Exhibit 2.6-8 Silverdale Regional Growth Center Boundary No Action.....	2-16
Exhibit 2.6-9 Silverdale Regional Growth Center Boundary Preferred Alternative.....	2-17
Exhibit 2.6-10 Reclassification Request List .....	2-18
Exhibit 2.6-11 Reclassification Requests Map.....	2-20
Exhibit 2.6-12 Comprehensive Plan Element Amendments .....	2-21
Exhibit 2.6-13 Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Update Process.....	2-22
Exhibit 2.6-14 Draft Development Regulation Amendments.....	2-23
Exhibit 2.6-15 Preferred Alternative Features and Description .....	2-26
Exhibit 2.6-16 Preferred Alternative Zoning Classifications and Acres .....	2-27
Exhibit 2.6-17 Preferred Alternative Zoning .....	2-28
Exhibit 2.6-18 Preferred Alternative Zoning Changes.....	2-29
Exhibit 2.6-19 Preferred Alternative Growth Assumptions .....	2-30
Exhibit 2.6-20 Preferred Alternative Unincorporated UGA Capacities and Target.....	2-31
Exhibit 2.6-21 Comparison of Alternative Growth Assumptions.....	2-32

Exhibit 2.6-22 Unincorporated UGA Acres by Alternative.....	2-33
Exhibit 3.2-1 Preferred Alternative Zoning Distribution – Countywide.....	3-5
Exhibit 3.2-2 Reclassification Applications Included with Preferred Alternative.....	3-9
Exhibit 3.2-3 Preferred Alternative Unincorporated UGA Capacities and Target.....	3-11
Exhibit 3.2-4 Housing Units by Alternative.....	3-12
Exhibit 3.2-5 Employment by Alternative.....	3-12
Exhibit 3.2-6 Summary of Countywide Travel Statistics.....	3-13
Exhibit 3.2-7 Projected 2036 Roadway Segment Deficiencies.....	3-15
Exhibit 3.2-8 Projected 2036 Deficient Roadway Segments – Preferred Alternative.....	3-16
Exhibit 3.2-9 Projected State Highways by 2036.....	3-17
Exhibit 3.2-10 Locations of Recommended Roadway Improvements by 2036.....	3-19
Exhibit 3.2-11 Summary of Cost of Roadway Improvements Recommended by 2036 (in \$ Millions).....	3-20
Exhibit 3.3-1 LOS Requirement Analysis – County Administration Buildings.....	3-21
Exhibit 3.3-2 Potential LOS Adjustments for County Administration Buildings.....	3-21
Exhibit 3.3-3 LOS Requirement Analysis – County Maintenance Facilities.....	3-22
Exhibit 3.3-4 LOS Requirement Analysis – County District Courtrooms.....	3-22
Exhibit 3.3-5 LOS Requirement Analysis – County Superior Courtrooms.....	3-22
Exhibit 3.3-6 LOS Requirement Analysis – County Community Centers.....	3-22
Exhibit 3.3-7 Potential LOS Adjustments for County Community Centers.....	3-23
Exhibit 3.3-8 Response Time Objectives.....	3-23
Exhibit 3.3-9 Fire Services and Population Density – Existing Conditions.....	3-26
Exhibit 3.3-10 Fire Services and Population Density, 2036 – Preferred Alternative.....	3-27
Exhibit 3.3-11 LOS Requirement Analysis – Sheriff’s Office Space.....	3-28
Exhibit 3.3-12. Potential LOS Adjustments – Sheriff’s Office Space.....	3-28
Exhibit 3.3-13 LOS Requirements Analysis – County Jail Facilities.....	3-28
Exhibit 3.3-14 LOS Requirements Analysis – Alternative LOS Based on Incarceration Rates.....	3-29
Exhibit 3.3-15 Potential LOS Adjustments – Alternative LOS Based on Incarceration Rate.....	3-29
Exhibit 3.3-16 Target LOS Requirements Analysis – Natural Resource Areas.....	3-29
Exhibit 3.3-17 Base LOS Requirements Analysis – Natural Resource Areas.....	3-30
Exhibit 3.3-18 Target LOS Requirements Analysis – Regional Parks.....	3-31
Exhibit 3.3-19 Base LOS Requirements Analysis – Regional Parks.....	3-31

Exhibit 3.3-20 Potential LOS Adjustments for Regional Parks.....	3-31
Exhibit 3.3-21 Target LOS Requirement Analysis – Heritage Parks.....	3-31
Exhibit 3.3-22 Base LOS Requirement Analysis – Heritage Parks.....	3-32
Exhibit 3.3-23 Potential LOS Adjustments for Heritage Parks.....	3-32
Exhibit 3.3-24 Target LOS Requirement Analysis – Community Park.....	3-32
Exhibit 3.3-25 Base LOS Requirement Analysis – Community Park.....	3-32
Exhibit 3.3-26 Potential LOS Adjustments for Community Parks.....	3-33
Exhibit 3.3-27 LOS Requirement Analysis – Shoreline Access.....	3-33
Exhibit 3.3-28 LOS Requirement Analysis – Trails.....	3-33
Exhibit 3.3-29 North Kitsap School District Level of Service Analysis – Student Capacity.....	3-35
Exhibit 3.3-30 Central Kitsap School District Level of Service Analysis – Student Capacity.....	3-35
Exhibit 3.3-31 Bremerton School District Level of Service Analysis – Student Capacity.....	3-35
Exhibit 3.3-32 South Kitsap School District Level of Service Analysis – Student Capacity.....	3-36
Exhibit 3.3-33 Level of Service Requirement Analysis – Kitsap County Solid Waste System.....	3-37
Exhibit 3.3-34 Sewer Cost Comparison by Provider and Alternative 2016-2036 (All Amounts in \$1,000).....	3-38
Exhibit 3.3-35 Kitsap County Sewer Utility Cost Comparison by UGA Alternative (Thousands \$).....	3-38
Exhibit 3.3-36 Growth in Households by Water Provider under the Preferred Alternative.....	3-41
Exhibit 3.3-37 Library Facility Space Per Capita, 2015 and 2036 Under Preferred Alternative.....	3-43
Exhibit 3.3-1 Reclassification Requests Map.....	4-3
Exhibit 6.1-1 Matrix of Commenters – Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update.....	6-17
Exhibit 6.2-1 Responses to Comments.....	6-30

## **APPENDICES**

Appendix A: Growth Estimates

Appendix B: Reasonable Measures

Appendix C: Zoning Maps

Appendix D: Transportation