

# Chapter 1. Summary

## 1.1. Purpose of Proposed Action

The Proposed Action is the 10-Year Update of Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan (10-Year Update) in accordance with the review cycle required by the Growth Management Act (GMA). Kitsap County (County) is updating its current Comprehensive Plan (Plan), which was adopted in 1998 and most recently updated in December 2005. The Plan includes policies and plans to implement the County vision for the future and to direct public investment and other efforts to implement that vision. The 10-Year Update would, if adopted, achieve the following objectives.

- Revise the Plan to extend its planning horizon from 2005 to 2025.
- Address population growth forecasts from the State of Washington as required by GMA. The current Plan is designed to accommodate projected population and employment growth from 1998 to 2017. The 10-Year Update would accommodate projected population growth from 2005 to 2025.
- Assure continued compliance with Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs).
- Revise Urban Growth Area (UGA) boundaries that direct where urban land uses and urban public services may occur.
- Amend Plan Land Use Map designations that direct zoning regulations to accommodate population and employment forecasts and to meet other community objectives for management of growth.
- Incorporate approved changes to all chapters of the Plan, as well as to the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP), Appendix A of Volume I, to accommodate population and employment growth.
- Refine policies on population and employment growth, land use, housing, capital facilities, utilities, transportation, economic development, natural environment, and rural and resource land use for the unincorporated areas of Kitsap County.
- Include additional or updated information and address changes in the county since the Plan's adoption in 1998.

## 1.2. State Environmental Policy Act and Growth Management Act Process

Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-210 authorizes GMA counties and cities to integrate the requirements of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and GMA. The goal is to ensure that environmental analysis under SEPA occurs concurrently with, and as an integral part of, the planning and decision-making process under GMA. The County has elected to integrate both the SEPA/GMA process and the document. Integration of the environmental analysis with the planning process informs the preparation of Plan amendments and facilitates coordination of public involvement activities.

## 1.3. Public Involvement

Public involvement, review, and comment are integral to this planning and environmental review process. The County has undertaken a proactive, comprehensive public involvement program to encourage participation in the development of Plan chapters and to ultimately develop a Plan that meets community needs. Public participation events are listed below.

The following public involvement activities have taken place. Summaries of the major meetings and opportunities for input can be found at [MyKitsap.org](http://MyKitsap.org). A summary of the public involvement process for the 10-Year Update is also included in FEIS Appendix A.

- Maintenance of a project website at [MyKitsap.org](http://MyKitsap.org).
- Coordination with open space and recreation planning outreach efforts.
- Stakeholder meetings, including special interest groups, private property owners, developers, fraternal organizations, neighborhood groups, and others.
- Project fact sheet.
- Project comment card.
- Public display boards.
- Scoping and vision public meetings (three in March 2006).
- Agency meetings with cities, special districts, and state agencies.
- Alternatives public meetings (three in May 2006).
- Focus groups.
- Kingston Phase II Working Group meetings.
- Silverdale Sub-Area Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.
- Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meetings.
- Draft Plan open houses/public meetings (3 meetings in August/September 2006)

- Public hearings, three in September 2006 at joint hearings with Planning Commission and BOCC, and a BOCC hearing in October 2006 over a two-day period.

## 1.4. Proposed Action, Alternatives, and Objectives

### 1.4.1. Objectives

Kitsap County's objectives for the 10-Year Update are listed below.

- Provide a Plan that serves as a complete and internally consistent guide for planning over the next 20 years.
- Fulfill the GMA requirements for 10-year comprehensive plan updates.
- Make necessary changes to the Plan based on changes to GMA and other state laws.
- Fulfill GMA and CPP requirements for planning in UGAs and rural areas.
- Accommodate the CPP population growth target through 2025 for unincorporated UGAs.
  - Review existing UGA land capacity and quantification of reasonable measures.
  - Incorporate sub-area plans for the Kingston, Port Orchard/South Kitsap, and Silverdale UGAs.
  - Review and size all other unincorporated UGAs (Poulsbo, Central Kitsap, East and West Bremerton, Gorst, ULID #6, and South Kitsap Industrial Area [SKIA]).
- Allow for a range of housing types and innovative designs to provide housing affordable to different income levels.
- Formulate policies and regulations that encourage a diversified economy and job growth.
- Ensure efficient provision of public services and capital facilities that serve existing and new development in urban areas.
- Formulate a Rural Wooded Incentive Program (RWIP) as it pertains to properties zoned Interim Rural Forest (IRF).
- Preserve certain rural parcels and intensify certain urban parcels through Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) techniques.
- Consider Land Use Reclassification Requests initiated by property owners as part of the 10-Year Update amendment process.
- Consider updated policies and regulations to implement the preferred Land Use Map and to achieve or increase residential and business quality of life in the county.

## 1.4.2. Proposed Action and Alternatives

### Overview

The Proposed Action—the 10-Year Update—would address four major components of the Plan and would also include some implementing regulations.

- **Vision for the future.** A revised vision statement for the future of Kitsap County is being adopted. The proposed vision statement refines the previous vision and encompasses the planning period through 2025, consistent with the 20-year GMA planning horizon.
- **Growth targets.** The Plan is updated to accommodate population growth targets adopted as part of the CPPs, allocating projected growth through 2025 to the cities and unincorporated areas of the county.
- **Land Use Map.** The following revisions to the Land Use Map governing future land uses are included in the Proposed Action.
  - Land use redesignations guide future land uses and densities so that they accommodate population growth targets and employment forecasts. Redesignations include refinement of areas designated for housing, employment, and protection of natural areas.
  - The Proposed Action includes changes to the designated boundaries in UGAs within unincorporated Kitsap County; the Preferred Alternative proposes seven UGA changes in particular in comparison to the December 2005 Plan boundaries. Changes refine the existing UGA boundaries to accommodate population growth targets and forecast need for additional employment.
  - Consolidations of Land Use Map designations as part of the Preferred Alternative. Consolidated Land Use Map designations will make it easier to rezone urban parcels in the future without the additional time and expense of a comprehensive plan amendment process. Detailed zoning categories are retained and updated.
  - In between the range of DEIS Alternative 3 which entailed 120 land use reclassification requests initiated by property owners, and DEIS Alternative 2 which entailed 83 requests, the Preferred Alternative includes 82 requests.
- **Plan policies.** Amendments to the goals and policies of the Plan are based on the revised vision statement, revised Land Use Map, and other priority County policy initiatives, and amendments are proposed for purposes of maintaining internal consistency. Policy changes are identified below.
- **Implementing regulations.** Development regulations, such as zoning, implement the Plan. A series of implementing regulations have been prepared as identified below.

Table 1.4-1 describes how the Alternatives address the major components identified above. The primary differences between alternatives pertain to the amount and location of growth. Table 1.4-2 provides an overview of these differences. Figures 2.6-1 to 2.6-8 (in Chapter 2) identify land use alternatives under study in the FEIS (see DEIS for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3).

**Table 1.4-1. Alternatives Comparison**

	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Overview</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continues adopted 1998 Comprehensive Plan, and extends horizon to year 2025.</li> <li>▪ Required for review as a baseline in the EIS.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides for more densification and urban growth area (UGA) expansion than Alternative 1. Alternative 2 specifies a lower expansion of UGAs and a greater intensification of uses within the UGAs than Alternative 3.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Specifies the largest expansion of UGAs with greater densification than Alternative 1, but generally less densification than Alternative 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Same as Alternative 2.</li> </ul>
<b>Vision Statement</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continues 1998 Vision Statement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Includes Vision Statement refinements based on visioning/scoping process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Continues 1998 Vision Statement.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Same as Alternative 2.</li> </ul>
<b>Growth Targets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Based on the current Plan, 2025 population allocations specified in the CPPs are not fully accommodated.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Fewer UGAs are oversized compared to Alternatives 1 and 3, and several are closer to but slightly under population targets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Several UGAs exceed their proposed population targets.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Same as Alternative 2.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use Map</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land use classifications remain the same as adopted in December 2005.</li> <li>▪ Includes Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential category at 5–9 dwelling units per acre (du/ac) and retains Urban Restricted at 1–5 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Density range for single-family, multifamily, commercial, and mixed use zones is 5–24 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ UGA boundaries remain per the adopted Plan, and as proposed in the 2005 Kingston Sub-Area Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides for greater housing variety.</li> <li>▪ Features more “upzoning” and mixed use opportunities within UGAs than Alternative 3.</li> <li>▪ Includes Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential category at 4–9 du/ac and corresponding Urban Restricted range would be 1–4 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Density range broadened for single-family, multifamily, commercial, and mixed use zones is 4–30 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Reflects priority study areas/recommended alternatives studied by Silverdale and Port Orchard/South Kitsap Citizens Advisory Committees (CACs).                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Includes many land use reclassification requests.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retains emphasis on predominant single-family patterns, provides less housing variety than Alternative 2.</li> <li>▪ Less “upzoning” and mixed use opportunities than Alternative 2.</li> <li>▪ Includes Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential category at 5–9 du/ac and retains Urban Restricted at 1–5 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Density range for single-family, multifamily, commercial, and mixed use zones is 5–24 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Includes majority of land use reclassification requests.</li> <li>▪ Reflects maximum land use options studied by Silverdale and Port Orchard/South Kitsap</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Provides for greater housing variety, slightly more than Alternative 2.</li> <li>▪ Similar to Alternative 2, features more “upzoning” and mixed use opportunities within UGAs than Alternative 3.</li> <li>▪ Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential densities same as Alternative 2, but Urban Restricted range would be 1–5 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Density range is same as Alternative 2.</li> <li>▪ Similar to Alternative 2, reflects priority study areas/recommended alternatives by CACs.</li> </ul>

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Proposes intermediate UGA boundary expansions that reflect lot patterns and environmental constraints.</li> <li>▪ Includes one UGA boundary contraction between Silverdale and Central Kitsap.</li> </ul>	<p>CACs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposes more extensive UGA boundary expansions than Alternative 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Similar to Alternative 2, includes many land use reclassification requests.</li> <li>– Proposes intermediate UGA boundary expansions but smaller than Alternative 2.</li> <li>▪ Includes one UGA boundary contraction between Silverdale and Central Kitsap.</li> </ul>	
<b>Comprehensive Plan Policies</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Goals and policies remain the same as adopted in December 2005.</li> </ul>	<p>Policies are comprehensively updated in all elements. Concepts updated include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Revision of the Urban Low and Urban Cluster density range from 5–9 du/ac to 4–9 du/ac and corresponding revision to Urban Restricted density range from 1–5 du/ac to 1–4 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Allowing increased density ranges for Urban High Residential and commercial zones, up to 30 du/ac instead of 24 du/ac.</li> <li>▪ Policy and map revisions consolidating Comprehensive Plan land use map categories.</li> <li>▪ Update of greenway and open space policies to match the 2006 Kitsap County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan and any identified corridors (e.g., rural corridor between Silverdale and Central Kitsap).</li> <li>▪ Update of housing and economic development policies to reflect a greater diversity of choices.</li> <li>▪ Update of transportation and capital facility policies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rural Wooded and TDR Policies would be amended for this alternative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policies are comprehensively updated in all elements. Changes are similar to Alternative 2, with the following differences:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Urban Restricted density range would remain at 1–5 du/ac</li> <li>– Rural Wooded policies would be amended for this alternative.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Update of utilities and natural system policies.</li> <li>▪ Update of land use, as well as rural and resource lands policies.</li> <li>▪ Inclusion of population allocation “banking” with respect to the Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, and West Bremerton UGAs.</li> <li>▪ Inclusion of UGA Association and UGA Management Agreement (UGAMA) policies.</li> <li>▪ Revision of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program policies.</li> <li>▪ Inclusion of policies to encourage sewer connections for all new development and/or implementation of new innovative wastewater technologies (e.g. wastewater membrane systems).</li> <li>▪ Revisions to low impact development (LID) policies.</li> <li>▪ Addition of reasonable measure policies.</li> <li>▪ SKIA sub-area policy amendment for Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA), and Urban Holding Area (UHA).</li> </ul>			
<p><b>Implementing Regulations</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regulations remain as adopted as of December 2005.</li> </ul>	<p>Includes zoning and development permit facilitation amendments. Regulation amendments include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Areawide redesignations and rezones to implement Land Use Map and policy changes.</li> <li>▪ Density and dimension amendments to match policy/map changes in Chapter 2,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Includes Rural Wooded and associated TDR regulations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Similar to Alternative 2 with the following differences:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Adds a regulation that implements policy to require adequate sanitary sewer service in UGAs.</li> <li>– Modifies TDR program allowing for rural properties</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	<p><i>Land Use.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ New Mixed Use zone, Parks zone, and Urban Holding Area.</li> <li>▪ Consolidation of some commercial categories.</li> <li>▪ A consolidated Use Table in Title 17.</li> <li>▪ Minimum densities in urban areas.</li> <li>▪ Revisions to maximum height restrictions in some multifamily, commercial, mixed use, and industrial zones.</li> <li>▪ Categorical exemptions from further environmental review for minor new construction countywide, and for mixed use and infill development within the Silverdale UGA.</li> <li>▪ Revisions to improve the clarity, consistency and functionality of existing development regulations, including, but not limited to, permit procedures (e.g., conditional uses, rezones, pre-application, etc.).</li> <li>▪ New TDR regulations.</li> </ul>		<p>that have sold a development right to restore the right by purchasing one from another rural property, and restoring development rights to properties if and when they are added to the UGA. Allow the County flexibility to determine, at the time of a comprehensive plan docking resolution, whether to require TDRs for sub-area or comprehensive planning efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Includes Rural Wooded regulations.</li> <li>– Modifies the density calculation for Urban Restricted to be gross acres minus critical areas.</li> </ul>



**Table 1.4-2. Overview of Alternatives: Unincorporated Kitsap County**

	CPP Growth Target (2005–2025)	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Total Population of Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas<sup>2</sup></b>	59,628 <sup>1</sup>	48,782—would not meet overall target (18% under target).	56,869—5% under target.	75,035—26% over target.	56,865—5% under target.
<b>Housing Unit Growth Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas<sup>2</sup></b>	No CPP target; however, it is related to population.	<p>Within UGAs 11,474 units—no change in capacity.</p> <p>In UGAs, growth primarily in single-family unit types (87% of total additional dwellings) and secondarily in multifamily (13%).</p> <p>Based on rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands.</p>	<p>Within UGAs 15,038 units—31% over existing capacity.</p> <p>In UGAs, growth primarily in single-family unit types (78%); greater percentage of multifamily than other alternatives (22%).</p> <p>Based on rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands.</p>	<p>Within UGAs 22,053 units—92% over existing capacity.</p> <p>In UGAs, growth in single-family unit types greatest of the three alternatives (87%) and secondarily in multifamily (13%).</p> <p>Based on rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands but one-third assumed to be on Rural Wooded lands.</p>	<p>Within UGAs 15,169 units—32% over existing capacity.</p> <p>In UGAs, growth primarily in single-family unit types (75%); greater percentage of multifamily than other alternatives (25%).</p> <p>Based on rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands, but one-third assumed to be on Rural Wooded lands.</p>
<b>Employment Growth Capacity Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas<sup>2</sup></b>	<p>No CPP target. County forecasts 32,664 net increase in jobs.</p> <p>Employment land demand in gross acres:  <i>total</i> 3,495  <i>industrial</i> 2,392  <i>commercial</i> 1,103</p>	<p>Approximately 20,000 jobs, no change in capacity.</p> <p>Buildable acres in industrial: 82% of total employment acres.                      Buildable acres in commercial: 18%.</p> <p>Gross acres of employment:  <i>industrial</i> 1,988  <i>commercial</i> 547</p> <p>Under both Industrial and Commercial land demand</p>	<p>Approximately 38,000 jobs, 90% over existing capacity.</p> <p>Buildable acres in industrial: 68%.                      Buildable acres in commercial: 32%.</p> <p>Gross acres of employment:  <i>industrial</i> 2,196  <i>commercial</i> 1,316</p> <p>Under Industrial land demand; over Commercial land demand</p>	<p>Approximately 47,000 jobs, 135% over existing capacity.</p> <p>Buildable acres in industrial: 75%.                      Buildable acres in commercial: 25%.</p> <p>Gross acres of employment:  <i>industrial</i> 3,276  <i>commercial</i> 1,369</p> <p>Over both Industrial and Commercial land demand</p>	<p>Approximately 36,000 jobs, 80% over existing capacity.</p> <p>Buildable acres in industrial: 72%.                      Buildable acres in commercial: 28%.</p> <p>Gross acres of employment:  <i>industrial</i> 2,264  <i>commercial</i> 1,074</p> <p>Slightly under both Industrial land demand and Commercial land demand</p>

	CPP Growth Target (2005–2025)	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Unincorporated UGA</b>	Not applicable	38.4 square miles outside of cities, no change in UGA from December 2005 update.	51.8 square miles outside of cities, an expansion of 13.4 square miles, or a 35% increase.	57.6 square miles, an expansion of 19.2 square miles or a 50% increase.	51.1 square miles, an expansion of 12.7 square miles, or a 33% increase.
<b>Densification</b>	Not applicable	No changes in allowed densities.	Densification allowed in six UGAs.	Limited densification allowed in six UGAs.	Densification allowed in six UGAs.

<sup>1</sup>CPP population targets represent an adjusted target to account for growth from 2005 to 2025, rather than the 2000 to 2025 period for which the targets were adopted as part of the Kitsap County CPP. The target established in 2000 was adjusted for this analysis to account for growth that occurred from 2000 to 2004. Adjustments were according to an average annual rate of growth based on the 2000 and forecast 2025 conditions.

<sup>2</sup>Capacity estimates are based on the County's Updated Land Capacity Analysis. See Appendix B for an example using the Preferred Alternative.

Table 1.4-3 shows the CPP population allocation for each UGA, and the population and housing unit capacity of each UGA under all alternatives.

**Table 1.4-3. Population Allocation and Capacity of UGAs under Each Alternative**

**a. Alternative 1 Population and Housing**

UGA	CPP Net Population Allocation (2000–2025)	CPP Net Population Allocation (2005–2025) <sup>1</sup>	Alternative 1: Without Sewer Reduction Factor <sup>8</sup>		
			New Housing Units <sup>2</sup>	New Population <sup>3</sup>	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston <sup>4</sup>	3,135	2,816	1,330	3,304	488
Poulsbo <sup>5</sup>	3,355	2,378	860	2,152	(226)
Silverdale	8,059	6,988	1,469	3,466	(3,522)
Central Kitsap	8,733	7,526	2,332	5,799	(1,727)
East Bremerton	2,210	1,905	639	1,590	(315)
West Bremerton	2,017	1,756	167	417	(1,339)
Gorst	73	73	0	0	(73)
Port Orchard <sup>6</sup>	9,709	8,212	1,031	2,558	(5,654)
ULID #6 <sup>4</sup>	8,024	7,553	3,646	9,075	1,522
SKIA	0	0	0	0	0
Rural area (non-UGA) <sup>7</sup>	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,220</b>	<b>59,628</b>	<b>19,642</b>	<b>48,782</b>	<b>(10,846)</b>

**b. Alternative 2 Population and Housing**

UGA	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2000–2025)	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2005–2025) <sup>1</sup>	Alternative 2: Without Sewer Reduction Factor <sup>8</sup>		
			New Housing Units <sup>2</sup>	New Population <sup>3</sup>	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston	3,135	2,816	1,117	2,774	(42)
Poulsbo <sup>5</sup>	3,355	2,378	938	2,344	(34)
Silverdale	8,059	6,988	2,931	6,973	(15)
Central Kitsap	8,733	7,526	2,777	6,294	(1,232)
East Bremerton	2,210	1,905	644	1,557	(348)
West Bremerton	2,017	1,756	576	1,436	(320)
Gorst	73	73	4	10	(63)
Port Orchard <sup>6</sup>	9,709	8,212	3,032	7,555	(657)
ULID #6	8,024	7,553	3,019	7,505	(48)
SKIA	0	0	0	0	0
Rural area (non-UGA) <sup>7</sup>	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,220</b>	<b>59,628</b>	<b>23,206</b>	<b>56,869</b>	<b>(2,759)</b>

## c. Alternative 3 Population and Housing

UGA	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2000–2025)	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2005–2025) <sup>1</sup>	Alternative 3: Without Sewer Reduction Factor <sup>8</sup>		
			New Housing Units <sup>2</sup>	New Population <sup>3</sup>	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston	3,135	2,816	1,328	3,301	485
Poulsbo <sup>5</sup>	3,355	2,378	962	2,404	26
Silverdale	8,059	6,988	6,424	15,677	8,689
Central Kitsap	8,733	7,526	2,947	7,332	(194)
East Bremerton	2,210	1,905	756	1,868	(37)
West Bremerton	2,017	1,756	715	1,786	30
Gorst	73	73	56	139	66
Port Orchard <sup>6</sup>	9,709	8,212	5,180	12,935	4,723
ULID #6	8,024	7,553	3,671	9,137	1,584
SKIA	0	0	14	35	35
Rural area (non-UGA) <sup>7</sup>	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,220</b>	<b>59,628</b>	<b>30,221</b>	<b>75,035</b>	<b>15,407</b>

## d. Preferred Alternative Population and Housing

UGA	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2000–2025)	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2005–2025) <sup>1</sup>	Preferred Alternative: Without Sewer Reduction Factor		
			New Housing Units <sup>2</sup>	New Population <sup>3</sup>	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston	3,135	2,816	1,117	2,774	(42)
Poulsbo <sup>5</sup>	3,355	2,378	860	2,152	(226)
Silverdale	8,059	6,988	2,901	6,877	(111)
Central Kitsap	8,733	7,526	2,594	5,882	(1,644)
East Bremerton	2,210	1,905	644	1,557	(348)
West Bremerton	2,017	1,756	576	1,436	(320)
Gorst	73	73	21	51	(22)
Port Orchard <sup>6</sup>	9,709	8,212	3,437	8,210	(2)
ULID #6	8,024	7,553	3,019	7,505	(48)
SKIA	0	0	0	0	0
Rural area (non-UGA) <sup>7</sup>	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>69,220</b>	<b>59,628</b>	<b>23,338</b>	<b>56,865</b>	<b>(2,763)</b>

1. CPP population targets represent an adjusted target to account for growth from 2005 to 2025, rather than the 2000 to 2025 period for which the targets were adopted as part of the Kitsap County CPP. The target established in 2000 was adjusted for this analysis to account for growth that occurred from 2000 to 2004. Adjustments assumed a constant rate of growth from 2000 to 2025.

2. New housing unit capacity was calculated based on the County's Updated Land Capacity Analysis and incorporated factors such as allowed density, existing land utilization, critical areas, public facilities, and market availability of land over the 20-year planning period. See *DEIS* Section

2.6.1 for a discussion of the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) decision regarding the sewer reduction factor. See *DEIS* Section 3.2.3 regarding socioeconomics for additional discussion.

3. Population capacity was calculated based on the housing unit capacity in the previous column. An average household size of 2.5 was used for single-family units and an average household size of 1.8 was used for multifamily units. These averaged household sizes are based on the Updated Land Capacity Analysis method.

4. For Alternative 1 in the Kingston and ULID #6 area, the transportation model level of growth analyzed in the Kingston and ULID #6 assumed a growth level consistent with the CPP targets based on the capacity information available at the time. The range of the transportation analysis, however, considers the capacity level for these UGAs at a maximum level, capturing the growth expected in the range of alternatives.

5. A portion of the Poulsbo UGA allocation in the CPPs was transferred to the City of Poulsbo's allocation to account for annexations of land from the UGA to the city that occurred from 2000 to 2005.

6. The Port Orchard UGA allocation includes the original UGA allocation plus the allocation for the Port Orchard UGA Expansion Study Area; it does not include any city allocations.

7. Due to the creation of excess capacity in the rural area through historic subdivision activities, the rural area allocation is not limited by capacity.

8. Transportation modeling distributions are based on Alternatives 1 and 2 with the sewer reduction factor and Alternative 3 and the Preferred Alternative without the sewer reduction factor. See *DEIS* Appendix B regarding *DEIS* Alternatives.

## 1.5. Major Issues, Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty, and Issues to be Resolved

Key environmental issues and options facing decision makers are listed below.

- Location of growth.
- Tradeoffs in balancing infill encouragement with UGA expansions.
- Changes in allowable development types and intensities in comparison to current plans and policies and zoning designations.
- The level and cost of capital improvements needed to support land use/growth levels.
- The extent to which impacts should be mitigated by avoidance or plans/regulations that provide for impact minimization, compensation, and other mitigation efforts.

All alternatives would result in significant additions of population. Employment growth would also be significant. Long-term local impacts resulting from any alternative include increased urbanization, cumulative impacts on fish and wildlife habitat, increased transportation congestion, and increased demand for infrastructure and facilities.

Although growth levels are intended to meet Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) and CPP growth projections, the primary differences among the alternatives lie in the distribution of growth, the focus on infill and UGA expansion, and the amount of associated capital investments.

Following public hearings and Planning Commission recommendations, the BOCC resolved the following:

- Refinement of a Preferred Alternative.
- Refinement of capital facility projects supporting land use, including transportation.
- Refinement of goals, objectives, and policies as well as implementing regulations.

## 1.6. Summary Matrix of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

DEIS Chapter 3 contains the full text of the *Affected Environment*, *Significant Impacts*, and *Mitigation Measures* sections for Alternatives 1, 2, and 3. FEIS Chapter 3 addresses impacts of the Preferred Alternative. The following sections 1.7, 1.8, and 1.9 contain significantly abbreviated versions of the full discussion in DEIS/FEIS Chapter 3, and lack explanations of terminology.

In Sections 1.7 through 1.9, mitigating measures generally do not list “Incorporated Plan Features”(self-mitigating features of the alternatives such as policies) or “Applicable Regulations and Commitments” (adopted codes and regulations); rather they focus on “Other Potential Mitigation Measures.” These are new measures that the County may employ to reduce impacts. Full lists of mitigation measures are found in the individual sections of DEIS Chapter 3, as well as Section 3.2.6 for transportation, and apply to all alternatives (DEIS Alternatives 1, 2, and 3 and FEIS Preferred Alternative) unless otherwise noted. Incorporated plan features of Alternative 2 apply to the Preferred Alternative since it is based on Alternative 2.

For these reasons, readers are encouraged to review the more comprehensive discussion of issues of interest in DEIS/FEIS Chapter 3 to formulate the most accurate impression of impacts associated with the alternatives.

For reference, updates to the DEIS analysis and the added Preferred Alternative discussion are shown in track changes.

## 1.7. Natural Environment

### 1.7.1. Earth

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Soil disturbance— countywide</b>	Densification in current UGA boundaries would result in loss of soil productivity through the expansion of impervious surfaces, modification of soil structure, and accidental or chronic contamination. Alternative 1 has the smallest UGA boundaries, protecting the largest portion of the county from these impacts.	Similar impacts as Alternative 1 though within greater UGA boundaries, which increase by 35% over Alternative 1 unincorporated UGA boundaries.	Similar impacts as Alternative 1 though within greater UGA boundaries, which increase by 50% over Alternative 1 unincorporated UGA boundaries.	<u>Similar impacts as Alternative 1 though within greater UGA boundaries, which increase by 33% over Alternative 1 unincorporated UGA boundaries.</u>
<b>Geologic hazard areas— countywide</b>	All current UGA boundaries (as of December 2005) contain areas of high and moderate geologic hazard.	UGA expansion areas for Silverdale, Central Kitsap, West Bremerton, Gorst, Port Orchard and SKIA include areas of high and/or moderate geologic hazard.  More lands would be designated as Urban Restricted in the Illahee area (Central Kitsap UGA) where areas are mapped High or Moderate Geologic Hazard. Limiting the density in this area reduces the potential impact of these hazards in comparison to Alternatives 1 and 3, which would allow Urban Low Residential.	Same as Alternative 2 but with greater UGA expansion areas for Silverdale, West Bremerton, and Port Orchard that include areas of moderate geologic hazard.	<u>Same as Alternative 2 but with less UGA expansion areas for Central Kitsap and more UGA expansion in Gorst that includes areas of moderate geologic hazard. Under the Preferred Alternative, the area of expanded UGA to the northeast of Port Orchard would be less than under Alternatives 2 or 3; therefore there would be less expansion into an area containing high and moderate geologic hazards. UGA expansion to the southwest of Port Orchard would be the same as Alternative 3 and would include areas of moderate geologic hazard.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	All existing UGAs contain areas of hydric soils that could be subject to liquefaction during seismic events.	UGA expansion areas for Silverdale, Central Kitsap, West Bremerton, Port Orchard, and SKIA include areas of hydric soils.	Same as Alternative 2 but with greater UGA expansion areas for Silverdale, West Bremerton, and Port Orchard that include areas of hydric soils.	<a href="#">Same as Alternative 2.</a>
	Mapped fault lines occur within existing unincorporated UGA boundaries trending from Bainbridge Island through Central Kitsap and along the southwest border of Silverdale.	Proposed Silverdale southwest expansion in vicinity of mapped fault line. Proposed Port Orchard UGA expansion to the northeast would be bisected by a mapped fault line.	Same as Alternative 2.	<a href="#">Same as Alternative 2.</a>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	The potential impacts associated with geologic hazards and hydric soils under Alternative 1 would be as described for the county.	Under Alternative 2, an area of high geologic hazard would be added to the Silverdale UGA to the southwest. Several areas of moderate geologic hazard and hydric soils would also be added to the Silverdale UGA, with both types occurring throughout the proposed UGA expansion area.	Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 2, with additional areas of moderate geologic hazard and hydric soils added to the Silverdale UGA in the proposed expansion areas to the north and to the east toward Brownsville.	<a href="#">Same as Alternative 2.</a>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reducing UGA expansions in Moderate and High Geologic Hazard areas would reduce the potential number of additional population exposed to risk of damage due to geologic hazards.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>All alternatives would result in increased urbanization in the county, with a corresponding increase in impervious surfaces and changes in hydrology. One unavoidable consequence would be an increase in erosion and sedimentation. Sediment reaching lakes, wetlands, and streams could have adverse impacts on the nutrient balances and other water quality indicators in these receiving waters and on the anadromous fish and other aquatic organisms living there. A greater population could also be at risk from the adverse impacts of damage to buildings and infrastructure should an earthquake, landslide or tsunami occur. Alternative 3 would pose the greatest potential for impacts resulting from urbanization and risk of damage due to geologic hazards, Alternative 1 (No Action) would pose the least potential for these impacts, and Alternative 2 <a href="#">and the Preferred Alternative</a> would be within this range.</p>			



## 1.7.2. Air Quality

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Construction emissions and ambient impacts—countywide</b>	Fugitive dust emissions from new construction operations would be controlled according to Puget Sound Clean Air Agency (PSCAA) regulations. Tailpipe emissions from construction equipment and haul trucks would be controlled by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) regulations. Construction operations could potentially cause temporary, localized impacts.	Same as Alternative 1; federal and local regulations would generally minimize potential air quality impacts. However, greater UGA expansion (35% more than Alternative 1) could lead to more construction sites and a higher potential for occasional impacts.	Same as Alternative 1; federal and local regulations would generally minimize potential air quality impacts. However, greater UGA expansion (50% more than Alternative 1) could lead to more construction sites and a higher potential for occasional impacts.	<u>Same as Alternative 1; federal and local regulations would generally minimize potential air quality impacts. However, greater UGA expansion (33% more than Alternative 1) could lead to more construction sites and a higher potential for occasional impacts.</u>
<b>Impacts from commercial and industrial facilities—countywide</b>	New industrial facilities would be required to install Best Available Control Technology. The PSCAA air quality permit process would ensure industrial facilities would not be allowed to cause significant air quality impacts.	Same as Alternative 1; PSCAA air quality regulations would generally minimize potential impacts. However, increases in employment compared to Alternative 1 could result in more local facilities with increased emissions subject to PSCAA regulation.	Same as Alternative 1; PSCAA air quality regulations would generally minimize potential impacts. However, this alternative has the greatest increases in employment and could result in more local facilities with increased emissions subject to PSCAA regulation.	<u>Same as Alternative 1; PSCAA air quality regulations would generally minimize potential impacts. However, increases in employment compared to Alternative 1 could result in more local facilities with increased emissions subject to PSCAA regulation.</u>
<b>Localized impacts from vehicles on public roads—countywide</b>	Tailpipe emissions from individual cars should continue to improve as a result of EPA regulations. Vehicles idling at congested intersections would degrade local air quality adjacent to the intersection, but it is unlikely that ambient	Same as Alternative 1; continuing improvements in vehicle emissions should prevent significant impacts. However, this alternative would generate countywide VMT higher than Alternative 1 (but less than Alternative 3) and would	Same as Alternative 1; continuing improvements in vehicle emissions should prevent significant impacts. However, this alternative would generate countywide VMT higher than the other alternatives and would increase potential	<u>Same as Alternative 1; continuing improvements in vehicle emissions should prevent significant impacts. However, this alternative would generate countywide VMT higher than Alternatives 1 and 2 (but less than Alternative 3) and</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
	concentrations would approach EPA air quality limits. This alternative would generate the lowest vehicle miles traveled (VMT) of any alternative, so it has the lowest potential to cause air pollutant emissions.	increase potential impacts.	impacts.	<u>would increase potential impacts.</u>
<b>Regional impacts from vehicles on public roads—countywide</b>	Countywide emissions may increase due to increases in VMT. Increases in population are less than Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) projections in its air quality conformity analyses. VMT for Alternative 1 is higher than PSRC forecasted values. Kitsap County would continue to be a relatively small contributor to regional emissions in the four-county Puget Sound Air Basin.	Countywide emissions would likely be higher than under Alternative 1. Population is less than PSRC estimates tested in their air quality conformity analyses. VMT for Alternative 2 is higher than the forecasted values for Alternative 1. Kitsap County would continue to be a relatively small contributor to regional emissions in the four-county Puget Sound Air Basin.	Countywide emissions would likely be higher than under Alternatives 1 or 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative.</u> The forecasted countywide population and countywide VMT for Alternative 3 are higher than the forecasted values for the No-Action Alternative and Alternative 2, as well as higher than PSRC estimates. Kitsap County would continue to be a relatively small contributor to regional emissions in the four-county Puget Sound Air Basin.	<u>Countywide emissions would likely be higher than under Alternatives 1 and 2 but less than Alternative 3. Population is less than PSRC estimates tested in their air quality conformity analyses. VMT for Preferred Alternative is higher than the forecasted values for Alternatives 1 and 2. Kitsap County would continue to be a relatively small contributor to regional emissions in the four-county Puget Sound Air Basin.</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-Area</b>	See countywide analysis.	See countywide analysis.	See countywide analysis.	<u>See countywide analysis.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation improvements would be made under all alternatives. If these improvements help the level of service (LOS) of inefficient intersections, localized air quality benefits would occur. If increases in roadway capacity attract additional traffic, the net benefit of the improved LOS would be reduced. Policies and implementation programs that help reduce VMT (e.g., improving transit utilization and carpooling) would benefit air quality in Kitsap County.</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Significant unavoidable adverse impacts	<p>Air pollutant emissions would increase under each Alternative based upon their growth levels. Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u> would generate increases in population that are similar to PSRC population assumptions. Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 would have countywide VMT estimates that are higher than PSRC figures, but the overall countywide amount would be about 6% of total regional VMT. <u>The Preferred Alternative VMT estimates would be about 6.5% of total regional VMT.</u> Alternative 3 has greater population and VMT than assumed in the PSRC Air Quality Conformity Analysis, but its countywide VMT would be about 7% of the total regional VMT estimates. Given the large cushion between forecasted regional emissions and emission budgets, and mitigation measures it is not expected that any of the Alternatives would create a significant unavoidable adverse air quality impact.</p>			

### 1.7.3. Water Resources (Surface and Ground)

This section refers to surface water basin boundaries identified in [DEIS](#) Figure 3.1-16 in [DEIS](#) Chapter 3.

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Surface water— countywide	<p>Implements current UGAs. Alteration of watershed runoff processes and stream flow patterns would result from the conversion of forested areas and creation of impervious surfaces.</p>	<p>Expands UGAs by 35% over Alternative 1. More alteration of watershed runoff processes and stream flow patterns than under Alternative 1 would result from the conversion of additional forested areas and creation of more impervious surfaces.</p>	<p>Expands UGAs by 50% over Alternative 1. More alteration of watershed runoff processes and stream flow patterns than under Alternatives 1 and 2 would result from the conversion of additional forested areas and creation of more impervious surfaces.</p>	<p><u>Expands UGAs by 33% over Alternative 1. Expands UGAs similar to Alternative 2, with some exceptions. Alteration of overall watershed runoff processes and stream flow patterns would be similar to Alternative 2, with some area-specific exceptions.</u></p>
	<p>Surface water impacts on streams are generally in direct proportion to the area of a drainage basin in impervious surfaces. Total impervious area in all basins is estimated at 45,100-48,200 acres. The highest percentages of total impervious area (TIA) in under Alternative 1 are in the Burke Bay, Dyes Inlet, Sinclair Inlet, and Bainbridge Island basins.</p>	<p>Surface water impacts on streams would increase over Alternative 1 in several basins and UGAs. TIA in all basins is estimated at 47,600–51,500 acres. The basins with substantial increases in TIA under Alternative 2 are Burke Bay, Burley Lagoon, Colvos Passage, Dyes Inlet, North Bay, and Sinclair Inlet. Smaller potential impacts would occur in the Liberty Bay–Miller Bay, Lower Hood Canal, and Upper Hood Canal basins.</p>	<p>Surface water impacts on streams would be greatest under Alternative 3. TIA in all basins is estimated between 48,500-53,600 acres. TIA would be greatest in those basins with the most land cover conversion to impervious surfaces: the basins with substantial increases in TIA under Alternative 3 are Dyes Inlet, Lower and Upper Hood Canal, North Bay, and Sinclair Inlet. Smaller potential impacts would occur in the Burke Bay and Liberty Bay–Miller Bay basins.</p> <p>More basin impacts are anticipated due to the larger UGA expansions than Alternative 2 and the change in development allowances for Rural Wooded properties, which</p>	<p><u>The Preferred Alternative has impacts closest to Alternative 2 given a slightly smaller UGA expansion at 33% and some alternative land use categories. Basins expected to be affected in the range of Alternative 1 and 2 due to alternative land use and smaller UGA boundaries include Liberty Bay basin, Burke Bay and Colvos Passage Basins.</u></p> <p><u>Impacts to the Dyes Inlet, Sinclair Inlet and Burley Lagoon basins are expected to be similar to Alternative 2.</u></p> <p><u>Impacts to the Foulweather Bluff, Upper Hood Canal, North Bay, Lower Hood Canal and Minter Bay basins are expected to be more similar to Alternative 3 with similar</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Wetlands—countywide	Continued urbanization in watersheds can result in impacts on wetlands due to the removal of forested vegetation and general increase in activity in the landscape where wetlands occur.	Higher levels of urbanization (beyond Alternative 1) in watersheds would result in greater impacts on wetlands due to the removal of additional forested vegetation and general increase in activity within the landscape where wetlands occur.	will allow for potentially more dwellings, although this may be offset by greater forest protection and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) incentives.  Highest levels of urbanization (beyond Alternatives 1 and 2) within watersheds would result in greatest level of impacts on wetlands due to the removal of additional forested vegetation and general increase in activity within the landscape where wetlands occur.	<u>SKIA UGA expansions and implementation of the Rural Wooded Incentive Program.</u>  <u>Higher levels of urbanization (beyond Alternative 1; similar to Alternative 2) in watersheds would result in greater impacts on wetlands due to the removal of additional forested vegetation and general increase in activity within the landscape where wetlands occur.</u>
	Wetlands occur in all UGAs. Development of the UGAs establishes as of December 2005 to their full density would likely lead to increased rate and quantity of surface runoff into wetlands, diminishing wildlife habitat and wetlands' ability to remove and/or bind sediments and contaminants.	Direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and their buffers same as Alternative 1. Under Alternative 2, the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, West Bremerton, Gorst, Port Orchard, and SKIA UGA expansion areas contain mapped wetlands	Direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and their buffers same as Alternatives 1 and 2. Poulsbo, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, Gorst, Port Orchard, and SKIA UGA expansion areas contain mapped wetlands.	<u>Direct and indirect impacts on wetlands and their buffers same as Alternative 1. Under the Preferred Alternative, the Silverdale, West Bremerton, Gorst, Port Orchard, and SKIA UGA expansion areas contain mapped wetlands. Slightly greater impacts in Gorst than Alternative 2 due to slightly larger UGA boundary, but less impacts in Central Kitsap UGA with no UGA expansion north of Waaga Way, and less impacts in northeast and east Port Orchard UGA where UGA boundaries are smaller than Alternative 2.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Groundwater—countywide</b>	Impacts on groundwater quantity generally result from changes in land use that reduce groundwater recharge and changes in population that increase demand for groundwater as a potable water supply.	Higher level of impacts on groundwater quantity would generally result from additional changes in land use (beyond Alternative 1) that reduce groundwater recharge and changes in population that increase demand for groundwater as a potable water supply.	Highest level of impacts on groundwater quantity would generally result from additional changes in land use (beyond Alternatives 1 and 2) that reduce groundwater recharge and changes in population that increase demand for groundwater as a potable water supply.	<u>Similar impacts as Alternative 2 given similar population growth, with slightly lesser impacts due to lesser UGA boundaries.</u>
	Impacts on groundwater quality result primarily from land uses that produce higher levels of nonpoint source pollution, such as urban runoff or residential zoning with septic disposal, and land uses that are associated with point source pollutants, such as industrial facilities.	Higher level of impacts on groundwater quality would result primarily from additional land uses (beyond Alternative 1) that produce higher levels of nonpoint source pollution, such as urban runoff or residential zoning with septic disposal, and land uses that are associated with point source pollutants, such as industrial facilities.	Highest level of impacts on groundwater quality would result primarily from additional land uses (beyond Alternatives 1 and 2) that produce higher levels of nonpoint source pollution, such as urban runoff or residential zoning with septic disposal, and land uses that are associated with point source pollutants, such as industrial facilities.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 with some localized differences.</u>
	Continued urban development under Alternative 1 will increase the amount of impervious surface, and could potentially affect groundwater recharge areas. Basins that have 10% or more impervious surface at full build-out would be expected to have greater impacts. At a consolidated level, the 12 basins reviewed appear to have more than 10% impervious surface.	Alternative 2 would increase growth in several areas, which could further affect groundwater resources at full build-out. Groundwater impacts would be expected to increase in basins with substantial increases in TIA. Under Alternative 2 these basins include Burke Bay, Burley Lagoon, Colvos Passage, Dyes Inlet, North Bay, and Sinclair Inlet. Smaller potential impacts would occur in the Liberty Bay–Miller Bay, Lower	Alternative 3 would increase growth to a greater degree than Alternative 2, and could further affect groundwater resources at full build-out. Groundwater impacts would be expected to increase basins with substantial increases in TIA. The basins with significant increases in TIA under Alternative 3 are Burke Bay, Colvos Passage, Dyes Inlet, Lower Hood Canal, North Bay, Sinclair	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 with some exceptions in some basins as described under Surface Water above.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	<p>Alternative 1 would result in additional development within existing UGA boundaries. Creation of impervious surfaces would result in alteration of watershed processes and runoff patterns in the Strawberry Creek, Knapp Creek, Koch Creek, Clear Creek, and Barker Creek watersheds. Continued urbanization would result in impacts on wetlands in the Clear Creek and Barker Creek watersheds. There could be groundwater impacts on Category I and II critical aquifer recharge areas.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would intensify development within existing UGA boundaries and expand the UGA boundaries. Beyond the impacts of Alternative 1, creation of additional impervious surfaces would result in alteration of watershed processes and runoff patterns in the Strawberry Creek, Woods Creek, and Clear Creek watersheds. UGA expansion areas could allow additional development in the Woods Creek, Chico Creek, and Anderson Creek watersheds. Alternative 2 would avoid impacts on portions of the Barker Creek watershed where the UGA contracts. UGA expansion would result in additional impacts on wetlands and Category I and II critical aquifer recharge areas.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 would intensify development within <i>existing UGA</i> boundaries (but less than Alternative 2) and expand the UGA boundaries beyond Alternative 2. In addition to the impacts of Alternative 1, higher percentages of impervious surfaces would result in greater alteration of watershed processes and runoff patterns in the Strawberry Creek, Woods Creek, Clear Creek, Barker Creek, and Steele Creek watersheds. Greater area of UGA expansion would result in additional impacts on wetlands and Category I and II critical aquifer recharge areas.</p>	<p><u>Impacts to surface water and groundwater resources under the Preferred Alternative would be similar to Alternative 2, with some exceptions. Impervious surfaces and runoff to Dyes Inlet would increase as a result of re-designation of Urban Low Residential land to Industrial land in the western portion of the UGA (same as Alternative 1 in this location). Groundwater impacts in this area would also increase, as it is in a Category 1 CARA. Impervious surfaces and runoff would decrease in a small area near Clear Creek as a result of a re-designation of Urban Low Residential land to Urban Restricted land.</u></p>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed.</p> <p><b>Surface Water:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encourage use of drainage systems that mimic natural drainage systems, such as vegetated swales, wet ponds, and created wetlands.</li> <li>▪ Implement all adopted watershed management and salmon recovery plans.</li> <li>▪ Adopt more protective detention standards that would require new development to infiltrate and/or detain larger volumes of stormwater runoff on their sites and in such a way as to better mimic the pre-development stormwater patterns. This would help to reduce downstream channel erosion, which would improve water quality. Detention standards could also encourage infiltration of smaller storm events.</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Adopt more protective water quality standards, such as more protective requirements for water quality best management practices (BMPs).</li> <li>▪ Reduce impervious surface area by adopting new low impact development (LID) requirements that set maximum limits on the percentage of impervious area allowed and increase the infiltration of surface water.</li> <li>▪ Provide drainage/treatment systems on a sub-basin level that optimize treatment and manage existing and future stormwater flows.</li> <li>▪ Retrofit existing detention facilities to improve water quality treatment. Even though these existing facilities typically collect stormwater only from existing development, retrofitting these facilities to treat existing runoff would help to reduce the cumulative impacts of future development on water quality. At the same time, these facilities could be retrofitted to increase their storage capacity.</li> <li>▪ Construct improvements that would correct existing erosion problems and reduce the potential for increased erosion in the future. This could consist of constructing channel stabilization improvements or bypass pipelines to divert high flows around sections of erosive channels.</li> <li>▪ Implement stormwater quality monitoring to evaluate the effectiveness of stormwater practices and standards.</li> <li>▪ Reclaim water from wastewater treatment plants to augment wetlands, streams, and aquifers and to decreased demand for potable groundwater.</li> <li>▪ Additional interties could be provided to enhance the reliability and efficiency of the water distribution system.</li> </ul>			
	<p><b>Wetlands:</b></p>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promote the preservation of onsite native vegetation, particularly mature trees (i.e., tree retention ordinance) and naturally diverse scrub-shrub communities.</li> <li>▪ Publicize and encourage the preservation of native soils and protect the natural processes of soil maintenance and onsite hydrology. Leaving areas/tracts ("belts") of native vegetation undisturbed in both commercial and residential developments can be shown to provide long-term benefits to stormwater management, onsite landscape maintenance, microclimate, and general aesthetics/sense of well-being in a developed landscape.</li> <li>▪ Consider larger wetland buffers for particularly complex or sensitive wetland areas.</li> <li>▪ Consider placing water quality improvement projects immediately upstream from wetlands (for example, provide compost filter in the last catch basin upstream from a wetland).</li> <li>▪ Provide for ongoing care and preservation of natural areas either by placing them into public ownership or by providing technical assistance and materials to property owners to enhance native vegetation benefits.</li> <li>▪ Encourage maintaining existing working forests by purchasing development rights from willing foresters to maintain forested landscapes.</li> <li>▪ Develop mitigation banks to provide before-the-fact mitigation for anticipated impacts on wetlands, streams, and habitat within each UGA.</li> </ul>			
	<p><b>Groundwater:</b></p>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Establish a groundwater monitoring program to provide the groundwater information necessary to assess the ability of the resource to be managed to sustain current and planned levels of growth.</li> </ul>			



Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expand intergovernmental cooperation to coordinate groundwater impacts across political boundaries.</li> <li>▪ Create and implement a groundwater education and resource program.</li> </ul>			
	<p>All alternatives would result in increased urbanization in Kitsap County, with Alternative 1 resulting in the least and Alternative 3 in the most. Two mechanisms that have significant influence on natural surface water systems, forest removal and creation of impervious surfaces (Booth et al. 2002), would unavoidably accompany the increased development. These impacts would be mitigated to some extent through programmatic land use/zoning, implementation of planning policies in the Comprehensive Plan, implementation of County codes, and implementation of project-specific BMPs. However, full mitigation of all impacts on surface water and groundwater resources is not feasible. Where development occurs in areas that are not now fully urbanized and are more heavily vegetated, there could be localized impacts because engineered surface water systems may not be 100% effective in replicating natural systems. Adverse impacts that may occur despite attempts to mitigate them are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Decreases in forestland cover, resulting in accelerated runoff and erosion processes.</li> <li>▪ Increases in impervious surfaces, resulting in accelerated runoff, increased volumes of runoff, decreased water quality, and decreased groundwater recharge.</li> <li>▪ Erosion and sedimentation of streams and wetlands due to increased flow rates and volumes, resulting in the decline of nutrient balances, substrate quality, and habitat availability.</li> <li>▪ Decline and eventual loss of some wetland functions for hydrology, water quality, and habitat.</li> <li>▪ Loss of vegetative cover providing shade, resulting in elevated water temperatures and increased stress on aquatic organisms.</li> <li>▪ Increase in pollutants from stormwater runoff to streams.</li> </ul> <p>Direct wetland impacts could occur if projects that encroach on wetlands are constructed. Mitigation would be implemented in accordance with the County code, but time lags in developing mitigation sites typically ensue before the site is fully mature and functioning as designed. Even then, mitigation success is known to be low due to lack of enforcement on long-term site maintenance, ecologically unsound design and implementation, and poor use of adaptive management (changing certain features with time to ensure success).</p> <p>Long-term cumulative reduction in groundwater recharge and associated discharge to streams is possible under all alternatives considered in this analysis. Similarly, groundwater quality could be affected. Proper planning, monitoring, and analysis prior to initiating developments can minimize and/or mitigate specific adverse impacts on groundwater. Specific mitigation approaches that maintain groundwater recharge quantity without compromising groundwater recharge quality should be considered in sensitive areas. In addition, long-term monitoring can provide indications of changing groundwater quantity or quality and provide time to develop a response to reverse negative trends.</p>			

### 1.7.4. Plants and Animals

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Vegetation— countywide</b>	Development would occur within existing unincorporated UGA boundaries, which total 38.4 square miles; the lowest potential impact on vegetation.	The total area within unincorporated UGA boundaries would be 51.8 square miles. The extent of potential development and the associated potential impact on vegetation would be greater than under Alternative 1, <u>and slightly greater than the Preferred Alternative</u> , but less than Alternative 3.	The total area within unincorporated UGA boundaries would be 57.6 square miles. The extent of potential development and the associated potential impact on vegetation would be greater than under either Alternatives 1 or <del>3</del> <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> .	<u>The total area within unincorporated UGA boundaries would be 51.1 square miles. The extent of potential development and the associated potential impact on vegetation would be greater than under Alternative 1 but less than under Alternative 2 or 3.</u>
<b>Rare plant species— countywide</b>	There would be no impact on mapped populations, all of which occur outside UGA boundaries as defined in December 2005. This alternative has the least amount of potential future development and the lowest potential to affect unmapped populations of rare plants.	There would be no impact on mapped populations, all of which occur outside the proposed UGA expansion area. Because the extent of UGA expansion under Alternative 2 is intermediate to Alternatives 1 and 3, the potential to affect unmapped populations of rare plants is also intermediate to Alternatives 1 and 3, <u>and slightly greater than the Preferred Alternative</u> .	There would be no impact on mapped populations, all of which occur outside the proposed UGA expansion area. The area within unincorporated UGA boundaries would be greater under this Alternative than under Alternatives 1 and 2; therefore, this Alternative would have a greater potential to affect unmapped populations of rare plants than Alternatives 1 and 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u> .	<u>There would be no impact on mapped populations, all of which occur outside the proposed UGA expansion area. The area within unincorporated UGA boundaries would be greater than under Alternative 1 but less than under Alternatives 2 and 3.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Priority habitats— countywide</b>	Mapped priority habitat wetlands occur within the December 2005 Kingston, Silverdale, and Gorst UGA boundaries. Mapped estuarine areas occur within the existing Poulsbo and Silverdale UGA boundaries.	Mapped priority habitat wetlands occur within the Central Kitsap UGA expansion area.	Same as Alternative 2.	<u>Central Kitsap UGA expansion not proposed north of Waaga Way with the Preferred Alternative.</u>
<b>Listed fish and wildlife species— countywide</b>	Twelve bald eagle nests are located within existing unincorporated UGA boundaries.	Five more bald eagle nests would be within UGA boundaries than under Alternative 1; therefore, this Alternative would have a greater potential to affect bald eagles. Two nests are within the proposed UGA expansion areas for Silverdale, one nest is in each of the Central Kitsap, West Bremerton, and Port Orchard UGA expansion areas.	Same as Alternative 2.	<u>Four more bald eagle nests would be within UGA boundaries than under Alternative 1; therefore, this Alternative would have a greater potential to affect bald eagles. Two nests are within the proposed UGA expansion areas for Silverdale, and one nest is in each of the Central Kitsap, West Bremerton UGA Expansion Areas. Under the Preferred Alternative, however there would be one less bald eagle nest within UGA boundaries than under Alternatives 2 and 3 because of the reduced UGA expansion area to the northeast of Port Orchard.</u>
	Alternative 1 encompasses the least amount of area (38.4 square miles) within unincorporated UGA boundaries. This alternative would have the least amount of potential new development and the lowest potential impact on fisheries habitat.	Under Alternative 2 the amount of area within unincorporated UGA boundaries is more than under Alternative 1, <u>slightly more than the Preferred Alternative</u> and less than under Alternative 3. The potential for impacts on fisheries habitat is greater than under Alternative 1 and less than under Alternative 3.	Alternative 3 encompasses the greatest amount of area within unincorporated UGA boundaries. The potential for impacts on fisheries habitat is greater than Alternatives 1 or 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative.</u>	<u>Under the Preferred Alternative the amount of area within unincorporated UGA boundaries is more than under Alternative 1 and less than under Alternatives 2 and 3. The potential for impacts on fisheries habitat is greater than under Alternative 1 and less than under Alternatives 2 and 3.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	<p>Category B salmon refugia occurs within the existing Silverdale, Central Kitsap, SKIA, ULID#6, and Port Orchard UGAs. No high-quality Category A or B salmon habitat occurs within the existing boundaries of the Kingston or Poulsbo UGAs.</p>	<p>The Silverdale UGA would extend into Category A salmon refugia in the Chico Creek watershed, and the Silverdale, Port Orchard, and SKIA UGAs would extend into areas identified as Category B salmon refugia.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 2.</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>
<p><b>Other terrestrial and aquatic species—countywide</b></p>	<p>Mapped habitat for the following species occurs within existing UGA boundaries: Mountain quail, pileated woodpecker, waterfowl concentrations, shorebird concentrations, and harbor seal.</p>	<p>UGA expansion areas would include habitat for great blue heron in the Central Kitsap UGA, waterfowl concentrations and shorebird concentrations in West Bremerton, and western pond turtle in Port Orchard.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 2 except that a purple martin nesting area would be included within the Silverdale UGA.</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>
<p><b>Plants and animals—Silverdale sub-area</b></p>	<p>Under all alternatives, there would be a decrease in the amount of vegetation within the existing UGA, potentially affecting third-growth coniferous forest and wetland habitats.</p> <p>Although no populations of rare plants have been documented within the area encompassed by any of the alternatives, impacts on unmapped populations of rare plant species may occur as a result of development.</p> <p>The existing UGA boundary contains Category B salmon refugia along its western edge that may be affected under all alternatives.</p>	<p>Increased UGA expansion (over Alternative 1 there) has the potential for greater habitat loss and fragmentation than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 3.</p> <p>Under Alternative 2, the UGA expansion to the southwest would overlap an area of Category B salmon refugia. Impacts in this area would include a reduction in the amount of forest habitat and an increase in impervious surface, resulting in an overall decrease in fisheries habitat quantity and quality and reduced water quality. Alternative 2 would include a greater amount of Category B</p>	<p>With the largest UGA expansion, there is a potential for greater habitat loss and fragmentation than under Alternatives 1 or 2.</p> <p>Under Alternative 3, the UGA expansion to the southwest would overlap an area of Category B salmon refugia. Impacts in this area would be as described under Alternative 2.</p> <p>The Alternative 3 UGA expansion area would include two additional bald eagle nests, as under Alternative 2; therefore, this alternative has a greater potential to affect bald eagles than Alternative 1, but is similar to</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
	<p>There is a potential for increased disturbance to terrestrial species documented within the UGA, including bald eagle and mountain quail. Increased roads under all alternatives would result in increased habitat fragmentation and the potential for populations of species to become isolated.</p>	<p>salmon refugia within the UGA boundary and so would have a greater potential impact on aquatic species than would Alternative 1.</p> <p>The new UGA expansion area would include two additional bald eagle nests; therefore, this alternative has a greater potential to affect bald eagles than does Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Alternative 2. Under Alternative 3, the UGA expansion to the east of the existing UGA boundary would encompass a documented purple martin nesting area; therefore, this alternative would have the greatest potential impact on purple martins.</p>	
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <p><b>Vegetation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encourage low impact development (LID).</li> <li>▪ Promote the preservation of onsite native vegetation, particularly mature trees (i.e., tree retention ordinance) and naturally diverse scrub-shrub communities.</li> <li>▪ Publicize and encourage the preservation of native soils and protect the natural processes of soil maintenance and onsite hydrology. Leaving areas/tracts ("belts") of native vegetation undisturbed in both commercial and residential developments can be shown to provide long-term benefits to stormwater management, onsite landscape maintenance, microclimate, and general aesthetics/sense of well-being in a developed landscape.</li> <li>▪ Increase regulatory guidance or limit expansions of UGAs in areas that may affect sensitive plant species or complex wetland areas.</li> <li>▪ Sponsor or encourage public education about the benefits of native vegetation.</li> <li>▪ Provide for ongoing care and preservation of natural areas either by placing them into public ownership or by providing technical assistance and materials to property owners to enhance native vegetation benefits.</li> <li>▪ Encourage maintaining existing working forests by purchasing development rights from willing land owners to maintain forested landscapes.</li> <li>▪ Develop mitigation banks to provide before-the-fact mitigation for anticipated impacts on wetlands, streams, and habitat within each UGA.</li> <li>▪ Provide a stronger program for maintaining BMPs such as detention facilities and water quality treatment facilities.</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Fish</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Periodically review critical areas regulations as part of adaptive management of riparian buffers because streamside and aquatic buffers and nearstream mature forested cover lessen many of the adverse effects of watershed-wide development on a watershed's streams and wetlands, and achieving adequate large woody debris recruitment and adequate temperature controls requires buffers consisting of mature forest cover.</li> <li>▪ Implement the WRIA 15 Water Resources plan for the Kitsap Peninsula and Islands.</li> <li>▪ Reduce impervious surface area by adopting new development requirements that set maximum limits on the percentage of connected impervious (effective impervious area or EIA) area allowed or encourage the use of pervious or semi-pervious alternatives. These limits would minimize the volume of surface water created on the site that would need to be treated and discharged to local waterways.</li> <li>▪ Schedule construction activities to occur during the dry season to reduce impacts on soils near wetlands and streams.</li> <li>▪ Require development to address temperature impacts from stormwater runoff or stormwater ponds.</li> <li>▪ Encourage increased infiltration of stormwater, where technically feasible.</li> <li>▪ Restore areas that have been degraded, have no salmon habitat, or have conditions limiting salmon spawning, growth, or survival.</li> <li>▪ Remove existing fish passage barriers.</li> <li>▪ Construct improvements that would correct existing erosion problems and reduce the potential for increased erosion in the future.</li> <li>▪ Retrofit existing detention ponds to increase their storage capacity and to improve water quality treatment. Even though these existing facilities typically collect stormwater only from existing development, retrofitting these facilities would help to reduce the impacts of future development on peak stormwater flows and water quality.</li> <li>▪ Adopt more protective detention standards that would require new development to detain larger volumes of stormwater runoff on their sites and in such a way as to better mimic the predeveloped stormwater patterns.</li> <li>▪ Encourage buffer enhancement. Where protected stream and/or wetland buffers are in a degraded condition, encourage enhancement of the buffer through means such as establishment of native vegetation and control of nonnative invasive plant species with a goal of providing high quality riparian and stream habitat and discouraging human entry into the buffer area.</li> <li>▪ Reclaim water from wastewater treatment plants to augment wetlands, streams, and aquifers and to decrease demand for potable groundwater.</li> <li>▪ Educate the public, especially those that own property along streams, about BMPs that could enhance or protect aquatic resources.</li> </ul>			
<b>Terrestrial Species</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consider reducing proposed UGA boundaries in areas of documented priority, threatened, or endangered species (<a href="#">DEIS Tables 3.1-15, 3.1-16, and 3.1-17</a>).</li> <li>▪ For any area in an expanded UGA boundary that would support threatened or endangered species, the County should require the landowner to prepare a management plan for the potentially affected area in coordination with the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) prior to permitting any</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Significant unavoidable adverse impacts	<p>habitat alteration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Promote LID, with emphasis on native plant retention in greenbelts between and within areas of proposed development to retain a portion of the wildlife habitat on the site and to preserve a measure of connectivity between areas of wildlife habitat.</li> <li>▪ Encourage buffer enhancement. Where stream and/or wetland buffers to be left are in a degraded condition, encourage enhancement of the buffer through means such as establishment of native vegetation and control of nonnative invasive plant species with a goal of providing high-quality wildlife habitat and discouraging human entry into the buffer area.</li> </ul>			
	<p><u>Added Incorporated Plan Features-Preferred Alternative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative Capital Facilities Plan includes some fish habitat enhancement projects to be conducted in conjunction with stormwater and wastewater capital facility projects.</u></li> </ul>			
<b>Vegetation</b>				
<p>Potential impacts under all alternatives include the loss and reduced function of vegetation communities as a result of population growth and development within the county. A reduction in the amount of vegetation communities would reduce habitat for wildlife as discussed in the wildlife section below. Additional development under any alternative would result in loss of larger tracts of native forested vegetation and grassland/pasture areas that also include nonnative species. Vegetation diversity (i.e., number of different native plant species and structure) would decline as the larger tracts of vegetation are developed and converted to vegetated suburban residential areas where lawns and nonnative landscaping increases.</p>				
<b>Fish</b>				
<p>Over time, changes in land use and development patterns would likely result in increased risk of impacts on fish habitat and species. Overall, greater human activity, culvert replacements, increased storm runoff, modified hydrology, and decreased water quality associated with discharges from commercial, agricultural, and roadway traffic sources would likely result from these alternatives. All these factors would adversely affect fisheries and aquatic habitat.</p>				
<p>Under all alternatives, fish habitat could be lost or suffer diminished function and value as a result of population growth and development within the county. In general, alternatives that allow for the greatest amount of new development and extend the land available for urban purposes would have the greatest potential effect on fisheries resources. Accordingly, the No-Action Alternative would be expected to have the least impact and Alternative 3 the greatest.</p>				
<b>Terrestrial Species</b>				
<p>A reduction in habitat would result in decreased abundance or local extirpation of species dependent on the habitat. On a landscape scale, wildlife habitats would become more fragmented and disconnected from adjoining natural habitats. Over time, some regrowth of native vegetation would occur within the UGAs as residential areas mature. Such regrowth would present an incremental improvement in habitat values for some wildlife species, primarily songbirds and small mammals. The reduction in habitat values for some species of wildlife would result in an increase in populations of those species adapted to more urban habitats.</p>				

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<p>Under all alternatives, wildlife habitat could be lost and degraded as a result of population growth and development in the county. In general, alternatives that allow for the greatest amount of new development and extend the land available for urban purposes have the largest potential to affect wildlife habitat. Accordingly, the No-Action Alternative would be expected to have the least impact and Alternative 3 the greatest.</p> <p>The precise extent of impacts on wildlife, wildlife habitat, and corridors would depend on the site-specific development plans for individual properties.</p>				



## 1.8. Built Environment

### 1.8.1. Land and Shoreline Use

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Land use patterns—countywide	Predominant land use pattern in UGAs would remain Urban Low Residential. Density range would equal 5–24 du/ac across zones.	Same as Alternative 1, but would also have more mix of uses and residential densities – density range would broaden to equal 4–30 du/ac across zones. Would also lower minimum density of Urban Low and Urban Cluster to 4 du/ac; would set Urban Restricted zone maximum to 4 du/ac.	Same as Alternative 2, with less mix of uses and residential densities than Alternative 2 but more than Alternative 1. Would retain minimum density of Urban Low and Urban Cluster at 5 du/ac. Density range would equal 5–24 du/ac across zones.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2, with more mix of uses and residential densities. Would also lower minimum density of Urban Low and Urban Cluster to 4 du/ac; however Urban Restricted zone maximum would be 5 du/ac as under Alternative 1.</u>
	The total amount of land committed to housing and employment would increase.	Same as Alternative 1 but to a greater extent. Most UGA expansion areas designated Urban Low Residential. Some Commercial along major corridors.	Same as Alternative 2 but to a greater extent.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2, but with somewhat less total UGA expansion, and less expansion of Commercial along major corridors.</u>
	General land use patterns would continue according to the adopted Future Land Use Map, with approximately 4,000 acres of developable land in UGAs.	Approximately 5,800 acres of developable land in UGAs, moderate expansion of UGA boundaries, greater infill/intensification of current UGAs and reduction in rural area than Alternative 1.	Approximately 7,300 acres of developable land in UGAs, greatest expansion of UGA boundaries, and less dense infill of current UGAs than Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative.</u>	<u>Approximately 5,600 acres of developable land in UGAs, somewhat less expansion of UGA boundaries, and somewhat different distribution of infill/intensification than Alternative 2.</u>
Conversion of uses—countywide	Land use changes would occur primarily on vacant and underutilized parcels, with the greatest changes in the Silverdale,	Changes more likely in designated growth nodes and corridors such as downtown Silverdale, Wheaton Way, National Avenue, Perry	Changes more likely in growth nodes and corridors, including downtown Silverdale, and along National Avenue; more limited	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with fewer changes along Wheaton Way and Perry Avenue and no commercial UGA expansion along</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Central Kitsap, ULID #6, and SKIA UGAs. Some existing residential property could be redeveloped for higher densities.	Avenue, Sylvan Way, and in expanded UGA boundaries; more changes than Alternative 1. Greatest amount of redevelopment of existing residential for higher densities.	changes along Sylvan Way and Perry Ave. and in the most expanded UGAs; more changes than Alternatives 1 and 2 <u>and the Preferred</u> due to UGA expansion. Some existing residential could be redeveloped for higher densities: more than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 2. An exception is Port Orchard – more infill is proposed along corridors than under Alternative 2.	<u>Mile Hill Drive. Added Mixed Use development along Bethel Corridor.</u>	
Areas with greatest infill would include the Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGAs.	Infill development would be more intensive in designated growth nodes and corridors such as downtown Silverdale, Wheaton Way, National Avenue, Perry Avenue, and Sylvan Way than under Alternative 1.	Infill development in Silverdale and West Bremerton would be similar in intensity to Alternative 2. Infill development in other UGAs would be in the range of Alternatives 1 and 2. An exception is in Port Orchard, where more infill is proposed along corridors than under Alternative 2.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2, but slightly less infill along Wheaton Way and Perry Avenue in specific locations than with Alternative 2. Added Mixed Use development along Bethel Corridor.</u>	
The total amount of land committed to employment uses would increase as infill occurs. New employment would be concentrated in the UGAs, with considerable new employment uses in the Silverdale and SKIA UGAs and to a lesser degree in Port Orchard.	More new employment than Alternative 1, with intensification of employment uses in designated growth nodes and along major transportation corridors, and a greater variety of light industrial, office, high technology, and commercial uses. The SKIA, Silverdale, and Port Orchard UGAs would have most conversion to new employment uses.	Greatest amount of conversions to employment uses, including in designated growth nodes and corridors and expanded UGAs for SKIA, Silverdale and Port Orchard.	<u>Somewhat less new employment than Alternative 2, with similar intensification of employment uses in designated growth nodes and along major transportation corridors, and variety of light industrial, office, high technology, and commercial uses. The SKIA, Silverdale, and Port Orchard UGAs would have most conversion to new employment uses.</u>	

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Changes in activity levels and patterns—countywide	Areas that would experience the greatest changes in activity levels and patterns include UGA properties that are designated for more intense development than currently exists, with the most potential in the Central Kitsap, Port Orchard, and Silverdale UGAs.	Same as Alternative 1, but with more changes in activity levels and patterns in downtown Silverdale; along Wheaton Way, National Avenue, Perry Avenue, and Sylvan Way; and in the Gorst and Port Orchard UGAs. Changes would be the most pronounced in the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, and West Bremerton UGAs, compared to Alternative 1. Changes at the edges of the Silverdale, West Bremerton, and Port Orchard UGAs adjacent to rural lands would also be more pronounced. The Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program would increase activity in receiving areas over Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1. Also, changes in activity levels and patterns in Silverdale and West Bremerton would be similar to Alternative 2, and changes in and Port Orchard would be somewhat greater. Changes in the ULID #6 and SKIA UGAs would be greatest of the alternatives. Changes in other UGAs would be similar to Alternative 1. The TDR program would increase activity in receiving areas over Alternative 1, similar to Alternative 2. The Rural Wooded Incentive Program would increase activity levels around clusters.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2, but with fewer changes in activity levels and patterns along Wheaton Way, Perry Avenue, and portions of the Central Kitsap UGA near Sunset Drive and Fir Drive, and along Mile Hill Drive in the Port Orchard UGA; and somewhat greater activity levels in the Gorst UGA. Added Mixed Use development along Bethel Corridor. Changes would be the most pronounced in the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, and West Bremerton UGAs, compared to Alternative 1. Changes at the edges of the Port Orchard UGA adjacent to rural lands would be less pronounced than under Alternative 2. The TDR program would increase activity in receiving areas over Alternative 1. The Rural Wooded Incentive Program would increase activity levels around clusters.</u>
Intensification of employment uses and associated increases in activity levels would occur.	Most intensive employment uses and associated increases in activity levels, particularly in designated growth nodes and corridors such as Silverdale's downtown and industrial area; Central Kitsap's Wheaton Way corridor; and Port Orchard's Bethel Road, Sidney Road, and Mile Hill	Similar to Alternative 2 in intensity in the Silverdale and West Bremerton UGAs, and affecting more area in the Port Orchard, and Gorst UGAs. Provides for most employment in SKIA.	<u>Somewhat less intensive employment uses and associated increases in activity levels than Alternative 2, particularly along Central Kitsap's Perry Avenue corridor, and Port Orchard's Mile Hill Drive corridor. Similar potential employment uses in SKIA as Alternative 2. Added mixed-use</u>	

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Land use compatibility—countywide	Greatest potential for land use compatibility impacts would be in urban/rural transition areas.	Drive corridors. More potential employment uses in SKIA.	Similar to Alternative 1 but potential impacts would also occur in portions of downtown Silverdale; along National Avenue in the West Bremerton UGA; along Bethel Road and Mile Hill Drive in the Port Orchard UGA; and adjacent to properties participating in the Rural Wooded Incentive Program.	<u>development along Bethel Corridor.</u>
	Approaching 2025, development in the UGAs would increase pressure for urban development on bordering rural lands and on underutilized UGA lands.	Development pressure on rural areas would be less than under Alternative 1; however, somewhat more rural area would be converted to urban uses.	Approaching 2025, pressure on adjacent rural areas would be less than under Alternatives 1 and 2; however, the greatest amount of rural land would be converted to urban uses.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with somewhat less development pressure on rural areas, and with somewhat less rural area converted to urban uses.</u>
	Urban shorelines may experience some pressure from continued urbanization under the existing Future Land Use Map.	Development pressure would be greater than Alternative 1 due to upzoning and more shoreline area included in UGAs.	Greatest pressure on shorelines due to larger expansion of UGAs along shorelines.	<u>Development pressure would be similar to Alternative 2 due to upzoning and a similar amount of shoreline area included in UGAs.</u>
	Alternative 1 would result in the greatest protection of existing rural and resource lands because there would be no expansion of current UGAs. There would be no TDR program.	There would be somewhat less protection of rural lands than under Alternative 1 due to expanded UGA boundaries. The TDR program would protect some rural areas.	Alternative 3 would have the greatest impact on rural areas due to largest expansion of UGA boundaries and loss of more rural lands. The TDR program would protect some rural areas.	<u>There would be somewhat greater protection of rural lands than under Alternative 2 due to somewhat less expanded UGA boundaries. The TDR program would protect some rural areas.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	Alternative 1 would have the lowest potential for direct and indirect impacts on environmentally sensitive areas.	Potential for impacts would be greater than Alternative 1, <u>slightly greater than the Preferred Alternative</u> , and less than Alternative 3.	Alternative 3 would have the greatest potential for impacts on environmentally sensitive areas.	<u>Potential for impacts would be somewhat less than Alternative 2.</u>
<b>Capability of land to absorb densities—countywide</b>	Land use capacity would be about 10,900 below the targeted population growth for unincorporated UGAs combined.	Same as Alternative 1. Land use capacity would be about 2,800 below population target.	Capacity would meet targeted population growth for combined unincorporated UGAs, but not for the Central Kitsap and East Bremerton UGAs. Capacity about 15,400 more than target.	<u>Same as Alternative 2. Land use capacity would be about 2,800 below population target. However, the Port Orchard UGA would have the capacity to accommodate targeted growth (its capacity would be within two people of targeted growth). Poulsbo UGA would be under targeted growth. Gorst UGA population closer to target than under Alternative 2. Remaining UGA results similar to Alternative 2.</u>
<b>Land and Shoreline Use—Silverdale sub-area</b>	Land uses and activity levels and patterns would continue similar to existing uses with some increase in intensity and activity levels. Does not provide SEPA exemption for downtown. Can accommodate less than half of the 2025 population target. Lower overall impacts than Alternatives 2 and 3 <u>and Preferred Alternative.</u>	Downtown area would transition to uses more consistent with a downtown over time, with greater increases in intensity and activity levels than Alternative 1. Provides SEPA exemption for downtown. Outside of downtown, expansion of Urban Low Residential designation would expand population capacity. Retraction of UGA in Barker Creek area would eliminate potential for urban development in this area. Expanded UGA for greater population and employment capacity, very close to population	Same as Alternative 2 but with greater expansion of UGA and somewhat lower intensity and activity levels in the downtown. Exceeds population target by about 8,700.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with greater increases in intensity and activity levels along Anderson Hill Road in the downtown, and somewhat less land use conversion and less potential for compatibility impacts in the western and northeastern portions of the UGA. Provides SEPA exemption for downtown. Outside of downtown, expansion of Urban Low Residential designation would expand population capacity. Retraction of UGA in Barker Creek area would eliminate potential for</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
		target (under by 15 persons). Lower overall impacts than Alternative 3.		<u>urban development in this area. The amount of UGA expansion would be the same as under Alternative 2, but population capacity would be slightly lower and employment capacity would be somewhat higher; similar population as Alternative 2 but still within 5% of target.</u>
Mitigation measures	In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Under Alternative 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u>, increasing allowed densities in UGAs that are below targets could allow for more efficient use of land and avoid additional UGA expansions.</li> <li>▪ Under Alternatives 1 and 3, the excess capacity in Kingston and ULID#6 UGAs could be reduced by reducing UGA boundaries, or providing for a different mix of Urban densities, such as under Alternative 2, Urban Low and Urban Cluster at 4–9 du/ac with a requirement for sewer or alternative wastewater technologies.</li> <li>▪ Under Alternative 3, the Silverdale and Port Orchard UGA boundaries could be reduced to reflect priority boundaries from citizens' advisory boards and public workshops.</li> <li>▪ Density incentives to encourage transit-oriented development could reduce the impact of increased activity levels by reducing demand for vehicle use.</li> <li>▪ Regulatory incentives could encourage high quality design in infill areas.</li> <li>▪ The County could institute design review for commercial and multifamily development under all alternatives. Appropriate criteria for site design and buffering would mitigate some of the impacts of new development on surrounding uses.</li> </ul>			
	<u>Added Incorporated Plan Features-Preferred Alternative</u>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes additional regulations supporting new policies that would require urban level sewer service in UGAs.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>A memorandum of understanding is contemplated between Kitsap County and the City of Poulsbo regarding a process to resolve population allocations and land use designations to accommodate the target growth.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes an additional UGAMA policy setting a timeline for Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton UGAs.</u></li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	Over time, the implementation of any of the alternatives could irreversibly commit vacant, partially developed, and redeveloped properties to additional or new single-family, multifamily, commercial, mixed, and industrial uses. The potential for this is greatest under Alternative 3 due to the higher amount of UGA expansion and least under Alternative 1. Under all of the alternatives, the UGAs will experience development and greater urbanization over time.			

## 1.8.2. Relationship to Plans and Policies

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
GMA—countywide	Includes mandatory comprehensive plan elements.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	Population target is within the OFM 20-year forecast range, but below the CPP target.	Population target is within the OFM 20-year forecast range, but just below the CPP target.	Population is within the OFM 20-year forecast range, but exceeds the CPP target.	<u>Same as Alternative 2. Population target is within the OFM 20-year forecast range, but just below the CPP target.</u>
	Intensive public involvement process as required by GMA.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	Plan <del>to be</del> submitted to Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, for GMA Compliance review.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	Supports infill development within UGAs and creates a compact land use pattern.	Greater support for infill development within UGAs and compact land use pattern than Alternative 1.	Medium support for infill development within UGAs and compact land use pattern.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2. More compact UGAs with a similar population as Alternative 2. Lesser density due to environmental constraints in Illahee area of Central Kitsap but greater densities in Port Orchard mixed use areas.</u>  <u>The Preferred Alternative would retain Urban Reserve zoning in the Central Kitsap UGA similar to existing County zoning. Resolution of the Urban Reserve zoning will be needed to avoid unusual UGA boundaries.</u>



Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	Does not expand the UGA beyond December 2005 boundaries and retains a relatively larger rural area.	UGA expansion of 35% and reduction in rural area.	Greatest UGA expansion (50%) and greatest reduction in rural area.	<u>UGA expansion of 33%, and reduction in rural area, slightly smaller than Alternative 2.</u>
	No regulatory or policy changes to increase densities. No policy or regulatory changes to support mixed uses beyond Urban Village Center (UVC).	Supports higher densities and greatest amount of housing variety. Policy and regulatory changes to support mixed uses.	Medium support for higher densities and housing variety. Limited allowances for additional mixed uses.	<u>Supports somewhat greater housing variety than Alternative 2. Policy and regulatory changes to support mixed uses.</u>
Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board Decisions—countywide	Intended to meet Board ruling for adoption by December 31, 2006.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	Does not reinstate Rural Wooded Incentive Program.	Same as Alternative 1.	Reinstates Rural Wooded Incentive Program with revised policies and regulations to comply with Board order for resolution of issues.	<u>Same as Alternative 3. Reinstates Rural Wooded Incentive Program with revised policies and regulations to comply with Board order for resolution of issues.</u>
	Proposes December 2005 Kingston UGA boundaries. The population would be just above the population target considering the period 2005-2025. Continues adopted reasonable measures.	Proposes December 2005 Kingston UGA boundaries. At slightly lower minimum urban densities (4 du/ac) the population would be just below the population target considering the period 2005-2025. Incorporates more reasonable measures in Kingston and throughout county.	Same as Alternative 1, with some additional reasonable measures, but less than Alternative 2.	<u>Same as Alternative 2. Proposes December 2005 Kingston UGA boundaries. At slightly lower minimum urban densities (4 du/ac) the population would be just below the population target considering the period 2005-2025. Incorporates similar reasonable measures in Kingston and throughout county as Alternative 2.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
SEPA—countywide	No changes in SEPA thresholds.	Provides for raising of SEPA exemption thresholds countywide.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 2. Provides for raising of SEPA exemption thresholds countywide.</u>
	No categorical exemptions for mixed use and infill development.	Includes categorical exemptions for mixed use and infill development in the Silverdale UGA.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 2. Includes categorical exemptions for mixed use and infill development in the Silverdale UGA.</u>
Vision 2020/ Destination 2030— countywide	Generally meets Vision 2020/Destination 2030 goals.	Greatest support for Vision 2020/Destination 2030 goals, with more support for infill development and a more compact land use pattern, higher densities and more housing variety, and therefore more support for an efficient multimodal transportation system.	Medium support for Vision 2020/Destination 2030 goals.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2, with support for Vision 2020/Destination 2030 goals, more compact UGAs, similar densities and somewhat more housing variety, and therefore similar support for an efficient multimodal transportation system.</u>
Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) — countywide	Generally consistent with CPP, except as noted below.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	Significantly below CPP targets for overall growth. This alternative would only accommodate 48,782 people in unincorporated Kitsap County, which does not meet the target of 59,628 established in the CPPs.	Slightly below CPP target for overall growth. It would accommodate 56,869 people, less than the CPP target of 59,628 people for 2005–2025.	Exceeds CPP target for overall growth (75,035 compared to 59,628 target). It is possible that the Rural Wooded Incentive Program would continue the trend of an attractive rural area and make it more difficult to attract urban growth to UGAs.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2. Slightly below CPP target for overall growth. It would accommodate 56,865 people, less than the CPP target of 59,628 people for 2005–2025.</u>  <u>It is possible that the Rural Wooded Incentive Program would continue the trend of an attractive rural area and make it more difficult to attract urban growth to UGAs. As with Alternative 3,</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
	New dwellings predominantly single-family, less supportive of goals for housing diversity. No update to transportation and public services policies or plans.	Greater housing variety and greater support for CPP housing policies. The capital facilities plan (CFP) establishes level of service (LOS) measures and, in some cases, standards to ensure that service levels can be maintained. The Transportation Element would also be updated.	Less housing variety similar to Alternative 1. The Alternative's growth levels would result in a greatly increased demand for transportation and public services and be less consistent with CPP policies on UGA expansion and other policies addressing coordinated services and facilities.	<u>initially the RWIP is a pilot program and monitoring is required to determine the program's effect on rural lands.</u>
<b>Kitsap County Planning Initiatives— countywide</b>	Allows for watershed planning. Buildable lands update underway for completion by 2007.	Allows for watershed planning and Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program. Buildable lands update underway for completion by 2007.	Allows for watershed planning, TDR program, and Rural Wooded Incentive program. Buildable lands update underway for completion by 2007.	<u>Similar to Alternative 3. Allows for watershed planning, TDR program, and Rural Wooded Incentive program. Buildable lands update underway for completion by 2007.</u>
	Some implementation of reasonable measures.	Implements reasonable measures to a greater extent than Alternatives 1 and 3.	Implementation of reasonable measures at an intermediate level between Alternatives 1 and 2.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 with addition of greater regulatory support for adequate sewer service in UGAs in addition to new sewer policies. Implements reasonable measures to a greater extent than Alternatives 1 and 3.</u>
<b>Municipal Plans</b>	Generally consistent with municipal plans.	Same as Alternative 1. There are, however, differences between the City of Bremerton Plan and proposed land use classifications in the Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, and SKIA UGAs. The City of Poulsbo	Same as Alternative 1. There are, however, some conflicts between the City of Bremerton Plan and proposed land use classifications in the East Bremerton, West Bremerton and SKIA UGAs. In Alternative 3, land use	<u>Similar to Alternative 1, but without the potential for inconsistencies with the City of Poulsbo Comprehensive Plan due to no changes to the Poulsbo UGA. There are, however, differences between the City of Bremerton</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Bremerton National Airport – Airport Master Plan</b>	<p>Airport land would continue to be zoned Airport, and land immediately adjacent to the airport would continue to be zoned Industrial. Additional industrial, employment, and very low-density residential development will likely occur on lands beyond the airport. For properties abutting the airport, special attention should be paid to federal and state regulations and Airport Master Plan guidelines related to height, noise, and density.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 1. The Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA) designation appears to lie outside of the runway protection zone to the southwest of the airport. Uses that would allow for intermittent or regular gatherings for recreation, or uses that would have tall structures could be of concern. Further coordination appears to be needed regarding the IMPRA and its potential allowed uses, which will be defined through a master plan, development agreement, and site-specific environmental review process.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 1. The Urban Restricted property located in the eastern portion of the SKIA UGA under Alternative 3 appears to abut the conical surface zone associated with airport operations. However, based on elevations that define the conical surface zone, building heights in the Urban Restricted zone are not likely to result in height incompatibility.</p>	<p><a href="#">Same as Alternative 2.</a></p>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	<p>See countywide analysis.</p>	<p>See countywide analysis.</p>	<p>See countywide analysis.</p>	<p><a href="#">See countywide analysis.</a></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kitsap County staff will coordinate internally to ensure that policies and regulations that are developed in association with ongoing planning initiatives and the 10-Year Update are consistent and meet the requirements of GMA.</li> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative and</u> Alternative 2 nearly accommodates population targets through infill of existing urban areas, upzones, and some expansion of UGA boundaries, thereby retaining consistency with GPP and CPP policies and GMA goals. Adoption of additional “reasonable measures” or limited geographic expansion of designated UGAs <del>under Alternative 2</del> may allow it to accommodate the CPP Population target.</li> <li>▪ Alternative 3 exceeds population targets for overall growth. Reduction of UGA boundaries could allow the overall growth capacity to be reduced to the adopted CPP target.</li> <li>▪ Kitsap County staff should establish a monitoring system to facilitate coordination of new and ongoing planning initiatives. This monitoring system would allow for review and incorporation of appropriate policies to reflect planning initiatives in the County’s annual plan update process.</li> <li>▪ City or County future land use maps could be amended as needed to achieve consistency with County and adjacent Municipal Plans. This could be accomplished through the UGA Management Agreement (UGAMA) process as specified in the CPPs.</li> </ul> <p><u>Added Incorporated Plan Features-Preferred Alternative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes additional regulations supporting new policies that would require urban level sewer service in UGAs.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>A memorandum of understanding is contemplated between Kitsap County and the City of Poulsbo regarding a process to resolve population allocations and land use designations to accommodate the target growth.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes an additional UGAMA policy setting a timeline for Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton UGAs.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>Through the UGAMA process the County and the City of Bremerton can resolve the final land use classification for the Urban Reserve lands in Central Kitsap.</u></li> </ul>			
Significant unavoidable adverse impacts	<p>With implementation of mitigation measures, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated with regards to future plan consistency under any of the alternatives.</p>			

### 1.8.3. Population, Housing, and Employment

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Population— countywide	<p>Alternative 1 would increase population in UGAs by 48,782, but would not meet the overall unincorporated target population of 59,628. Locationally, it would accommodate allocated population growth through 2025 in the Kingston and ULID #6 UGAs, but not in the Poulsbo, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, Gorst, and Port Orchard UGAs.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would accommodate 56,869 people in unincorporated Kitsap County, just under the CPP target of 59,628 people for 2005 to 2025. The percent below the individual UGA target is generally less than 5% for Kingston, Poulsbo, Silverdale, and ULID#6, but greater than 5% for Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, Port Orchard, and Gorst. If the utility factor is included, then the number of UGAs with a greater than 5% deficit would be more numerous.</p> <p>Alternative 2 broadens the residential density range from 5–24 du/ac to 4–30 du/ac overall. Based on the minimum of 4 du/ac this reduces the population capacity of the single-family designated areas; however, the new minimum of 4 du/ac still meets GMA urban densities. Alternative 2 includes more Mixed Use and multifamily zoning in comparison to Alternatives 1 and 3 that partially offset the capacity reduction to 4 du/ac, and also includes additional reasonable measures.</p>	<p>This alternative would significantly exceed the CPP population growth target for the unincorporated area as a whole -- 75,035 accommodated versus 59,628 target -- and would exceed individual targets for seven of the nine UGAs. It would provide population to a tenth UGA that does not have a population allocation (i.e., SKIA). The population capacity would be over the target in the Kingston, Silverdale, Port Orchard, Gorst, and ULID #6 UGAs; slightly above the target in the Poulsbo and West Bremerton UGAs; and slightly under the target in the in the Central Kitsap and East Bremerton UGAs.</p>	<p><u>Alternative 2 would accommodate 56,865 people in unincorporated Kitsap County, just under the CPP target of 59,628 people for 2005 to 2025. The percentage below the individual UGA target is generally less than 5% for Kingston, Silverdale, Port Orchard and ULID#6 but greater than 5% for Poulsbo, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, and Gorst UGAs although the Gorst UGA gap is improved.</u></p> <p><u>Similar proposal as Alternative 2 to broaden the residential density range to 4-30 du/ac overall, and to provide a new minimum density of 4 du/ac that still meets GMA urban densities. The Preferred Alternative includes the greatest percent of multifamily dwellings, and promotes Mixed Use zoning similar to Alternative 2 with less Mixed Use in Central Kitsap and greater Mixed Use in Port Orchard. Upzoning partially offsets the capacity reduction to 4 du/ac. The Preferred Alternative also includes additional reasonable measures.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Housing—countywide	<p>Alternative 1 would supply housing within current UGA boundaries and in the rural area, but would not meet the estimated countywide housing need. With Alternative 1, only the rural area dwelling units are projected to be within the range of housing units needed. Kingston and ULID#6 would exceed the number of dwellings needed, and the remaining UGAs would supply less than the housing demand range.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would provide housing units below the housing need range. Individually within UGAs, there would be some variation. With the sewer factor included, Poulsbo, Silverdale, and ULID#6 would have dwellings within the range; without the sewer factor, the UGAs that would supply housing within the demand range would increase and include the addition of Kingston, Poulsbo, Silverdale, and ULID#6. All other UGAs would have dwellings below the housing need range, based on minimum densities.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 provides for housing well above the housing need forecast. Kingston, Silverdale, Gorst, Port Orchard, and ULID#6 UGA housing supply would exceed the housing need range as well as SKIA. Assuming the inclusion of the sewer factor, the Central Kitsap and East Bremerton UGAs would have housing units below the demand range whereas excluding the sewer factor, these UGAs would be within the demand range. For other UGAs, estimated supply is within the range of housing needs but either above or below the mid-point.</p>	<p><u>The Preferred Alternative would provide housing units just above the minimum housing demand range. The UGAs that would supply housing within the demand range would include Kingston, Silverdale, Port Orchard, and ULID#6. Poulsbo, Central Kitsap, East and West Bremerton and Gorst would have dwellings below the housing need range, based on minimum densities.</u></p>
	<p>In terms of affordability, Alternative 1 would on the whole provide rental and owner housing above projected numbers of households “in need”<sup>1</sup> but would not meet the overall housing demand. If the overall demand is not met, it could be more difficult for affordable housing to be available to households “in need” because they could be “outcompeted” by households with greater income.</p>	<p>In terms of rental and owner housing and affordability, Alternative 2 would be slightly below rental and owner housing forecasts at the mid-point but well above the households “in need” projection.</p>	<p>Alternative 3 would provide for rental and owner housing well above estimates of households “in need” and above total housing need. This may mean housing market pressures could be lower than under Alternatives 1 and 2; however the UGAs are larger than required to meet population allocations.</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2, but improved.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	<p>In terms of housing variety, Alternative 1 would maintain a predominance of single-family housing stock (87%) and have less diversity than Alternative 2 and a similar diversity as Alternative 3. Density range of new residential development would be 5–24 du/ac.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 would provide a greater variety of new housing unit types than is currently allowed. In UGAs, new housing would consist primarily of single-family unit types (78%), but there would be a greater percentage of multifamily units than <del>other</del> Alternatives <u>1 and 3</u> (equal to 22%), and densities range would be 4–30 du/ac.</p>	<p>This alternative would include less upzoning and fewer opportunities for mixed use development than Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u>, but more than under Alternative 1. In UGAs, growth in single-family units would be the greater than all alternatives studied. Alternative 3 would be similar to Alternative 1 in the predominance of single-family (87% of new dwellings). Alternative 3 is less diverse than Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> in unit types. Density range of new residential development would be 5–24 du/ac.</p>	<p><u>The Preferred Alternative would provide a greater variety of new housing unit types than is currently allowed, and more than any other alternative studied. In UGAs, new housing would consist primarily of single-family unit types (75%), but there would be a greater percentage of multifamily units than other alternatives (25%), and densities range from 4–30 du/ac.</u></p>
<p>Employment— countywide</p>	<p>The Alternative 1 job capacity is below the 2025 job forecast for Unincorporated Kitsap County; it would meet about 60% of the demand. Its number of employment acres are also below the target employment acres.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 is approximately 17% above forecast needs in terms of total jobs and 1% above total employment acre demand projections. Within job sectors, Alternative 2 slightly below the industrial job and acre forecasts, and moderately above the commercial job and commercial acre forecast.</p> <p>If SKIA were expanded to include the Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA), no development could occur until a master plan and development agreement are prepared which will</p>	<p>Alternative 3 would have a substantially greater capacity for jobs than the forecasts estimate are needed and greater than the capacity of Alternatives 1 and 2. Alternative 3 is 44% above forecasted total jobs and exceeds employment acre demand estimates by 33%.</p> <p>Within job sectors, Alternative 3 provides for substantively more commercial and industrial jobs above the job sector forecasts, largely due to the SKIA Business Center expansion and to the Port Orchard commercial expansion.</p>	<p><u>The Preferred Alternative approximately 4% below total employment acre demand projections. In terms of job capacity, the Preferred Alternative is approximately 11% above forecast. Within job sectors, the Preferred Alternative is slightly below the industrial job and acre forecasts. It is moderately above the commercial job forecast but below commercial acre forecast. Overall, however, the Preferred Alternative is generally more in balance than with other Alternatives studied.</u></p>



Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
		<p>result in new implementing zones (a subsequent legislative action that would require additional public review).</p> <p>At the time of a master plan, the number of jobs would be forecast which may be similar or different than current assumptions. Unique uses, such as mineral operations, colleges, and recreational facilities (such as a speedway, golf course, etc.) are not included in the employment land demand forecasting as they do not involve buildings in the traditional manner. Therefore, unique uses in the IMPRA would add to the employment land demand analysis and not subtract from it.</p>	<p>The SKIA UGA expansion is the same area as Alternative 2, but unlike the IMPRA, which would be a holding designation for unique employment uses not currently accounted in the employment land demand analysis, the proposed land use classification under Alternative 3 is Business Center, a typical land use category in Kitsap County. When assumed with typical Business Center type jobs, Alternative 3 would exceed the employment acre demand analysis.</p>	<p><u>Similar approach in SKIA as for Alternative 2.</u></p>
<p><b>Population, housing and employment—Silverdale sub-area</b></p>	<p>Under Alternative 1, Silverdale's population capacity would be 50% below the projection. Silverdale's housing capacity would be below the estimated housing need. About 4,200 jobs would be added.</p>	<p>Under Alternative 2, Silverdale's population would increase and be about 0.2% below the target. Silverdale's housing capacity would increase and would be in the range of estimated housing demand. There would be an estimated job increase of about 7,400.</p>	<p>Under Alternative 3, the population capacity would increase substantially, exceeding the target by 124%. Silverdale's housing capacity would be more than double forecast housing demand. Jobs are estimated to increase by about 7,200.</p>	<p><u>With the Preferred Alternative, the population would increase, and be about 1.6% below the UGA target. Silverdale's housing capacity would increase and would be in the range of estimated housing demand. The estimated job increase would equal about 7,700.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ For UGAs that show population capacities below population targets, the County could consider additional reasonable measures primarily and UGA expansions secondarily, as appropriate. Measures to increase the development capacity could include applying incentives or requirements for a greater minimum density and allowing for limited UGA expansion with the range of Alternative 3.</li> <li>▪ Other measures to increase population capacity in a phased manner include conducting joint planning with affected adjacent jurisdictions to determine appropriate land use categories to attain the population target. Until joint planning is complete, the population would be held in reserve. This may be appropriate for the Central, East Bremerton, and West Bremerton UGAs, where joint planning, and/or population shifts among the city of Bremerton and between UGAs may allow for achievement of targets.</li> <li>▪ Amending the CPPs to shift population between UGAs that have greater potential to be densified or expanded to accommodate population while retaining the overall unincorporated county population target. For example, population could be shifted from Gorst, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, and West Bremerton to Silverdale or Port Orchard/South Kitsap.</li> <li>▪ For UGAs that show capacities greater than the population targets, UGA boundaries should be decreased. Areas should be removed that are more costly to provide public services or that have significant concentrations of critical areas or constraints or that are considered lower priorities by CACs. Alternatively or in combination, a different mix of densities or land uses may also assist the achievement of CPP targets, provided the densities are still urban in nature and can be served with public services.</li> <li>▪ Measures to balance population with growth targets should also bring housing supply in balance with total and affordable housing demand.</li> <li>▪ Alternatives 1 and 3 that provide less housing variety could be amended to allow for mixed use and moderate- or high-density residential uses to meet a greater spectrum of housing needs.</li> <li>▪ To avoid an oversupply of employment land that is unused during the 20-year planning period, the County could reduce the proposed amount of land designated for commercial and industrial employment use under Alternative 3 and commercial use under Alternative 2 to reach a corresponding level of jobs as the employment forecast.</li> </ul>			
	<p><b><u>Added Incorporated Plan Features-Preferred Alternative</u></b></p>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative brings commercial acres in alignment with employment land demand. Employment capacity for commercial is above the employment forecast using the EIS methodology, which may no be as precise as the employment land demand analysis. Through proposed land use policies promoting land capacity monitoring, the County can review the employment densities and employment land demand particularly for commercial activities.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes additional regulations supporting new policies that would require urban level sewer service in UGAs.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>A memorandum of understanding is contemplated between Kitsap County and the City of Poulsbo regarding a process to resolve population allocations and land use designations to accommodate the target growth.</u></li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes an additional UGAMA policy setting a timeline for Central Kitsap, East Bremerton and West Bremerton UGAs.</u></li> <li>▪ <u>Through the UGAMA process the County and the City of Bremerton can resolve the final land use classification for the Urban Reserve lands in Central Kitsap.</u></li> </ul>			
	<p>Population, employment and housing will increase under any of the Alternatives reviewed, to different degrees, with Alternative 1 the least and Alternative 3 the greatest. Additional population growth will increase the demand for housing. Additional population, housing, and employment growth will result in secondary impacts on the natural and built environment and to the demand for public services, and is addressed in the appropriate sections of <del>this</del> <u>the</u> DEIS <u>and</u> FEIS.</p>			

<sup>1</sup>Households in need are those earning less 80% of the County median and spending more than 30% of their income on housing.

### 1.8.4. Cultural Resources

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Historic and cultural resource conversion—countywide</b>	<p>Future development could affect known and unidentified historic or archeological sites.</p> <p>Identified historic or archeological sites in areas proposed for urban uses would likely be subject to stronger development pressure than sites in rural areas.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 1, except greater potential for conversion of potential sites because UGAs would expand by 35% more than under Alternative 1.</p> <p>Several locally significant historic and archaeological sites could potentially be affected by development pressure due to UGA expansion in Silverdale and Port Orchard UGAs. A few more locally important historic sites could potentially be affected by upzones in West Bremerton and Gorst.</p>	<p>Greatest potential for impact. Expands UGAs by 50% over Alternative 1.</p> <p>Most historic and cultural sites are located in incorporated jurisdictions and rural areas. In comparison to Alternative 2, there would be a few additional locally important historic or archaeological sites that could be affected by UGA expansions in the Silverdale and Gorst UGAs. Otherwise, there could be similar potential for locally important historic sites to be affected by upzones in West Bremerton and Gorst.</p>	<p><u>Similar to Alternative 2, except proposed 33% UGA expansion rather than 35%.</u></p>
	<p>Growth in the rural areas would be dispersed over a larger area, potentially affecting rural historic and cultural sites.</p>	<p>Growth in rural areas would be dispersed over a smaller area than under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Growth in rural areas would be dispersed over a smaller area than under Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u>, due to more area in UGAs. More potential for Rural Wooded properties to develop.</p>	<p><u>Growth in rural areas would be dispersed over a smaller area than under Alternative 1. More rural area remains than under Alternative 2. More potential for Rural Wooded properties to develop.</u></p>
<b>Archaeological and cultural resources—countywide</b>	<p>Alternative 1 provides the least amount of urban areas adjoining water bodies where possible archeological cultural sites tend to be located.</p>	<p>Alternative 2 adds more land area adjoining Puget Sound shorelines and other water bodies to UGAs than Alternative 1, increasing potential urban development in those areas. This may expose</p>	<p>Alternative 3 adds more land area adjoining Puget Sound shorelines and other water bodies to potential urban development than Alternatives 1 or 2, potentially exposing more archaeological and</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
		<p>more potential archaeological and cultural resources to urban development pressures. UGA expansions along shorelines would occur in four UGAs (Silverdale, Central Kitsap, West Bremerton, and Port Orchard). This alternative would also remove urban designation and incentive for redevelopment along Barker Creek.</p>	<p>cultural resources to urban development pressures than either alternative. Greater UGA expansions along shorelines than would occur under Alternative 2 are proposed for the Silverdale UGA. In addition, there are more UGA expansions around creeks and valleys under Alternative 3 than Alternative 2. Expansions into these areas occur in the Silverdale and Gorst UGAs.</p>	
<p><b>Cultural resources— Silverdale sub-area</b></p>	<p>Same as countywide analysis.</p>	<p>Several locally significant historic and archaeological sites could potentially be affected by development pressure due to UGA expansion, particularly along shorelines.</p>	<p>Several locally significant historic and archaeological sites could potentially be affected by development pressure due to UGA expansion, particularly along shorelines. Alternative 3 entails greater expansion along shorelines than Alternative 2.</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>
<p><b>Mitigation measures</b></p>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A policy or program could be developed to promote improved ongoing communication and coordination strategies with local Tribes in an effort to better preserve and enhance cultural resources. <u>Such coordination would be in addition to coordination with State agencies.</u> Further amendments to the building and zoning codes could be considered that provide a variety of forms of assistance to developers and property owners to account for the historic and culturally significant sites. <u>Additionally, code amendments should address a process for inadvertent discovery of cultural resources and coordination with State and tribal agencies.</u></li> </ul>			
<p><b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b></p>	<p>Future growth and development within Kitsap County will increase pressure for the redevelopment of historic and archaeologically significant sites. Future development activities could disturb or destroy previously undiscovered as well as registered historic and archaeological artifacts and structures. Consistent application of federal, state, and local laws should reduce the potential for impacts on cultural resources.</p>			

### 1.8.5. Aesthetics

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Visual character—countywide	<p>Continued urbanization based on adopted land use designations; changes in visual character would occur as vacant land is developed. Impacts would be greatest in designated centers where infill development at higher densities would occur.</p> <p>Minor changes to rural areas where development occurs under existing rural designations, but no conversion of rural area to urban character. Local Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs) (Port Gamble, George's Corner, Suquamish, and Manchester or Hansville), Keyport Rural Village, and other rural small town communities would develop in accordance with adopted plans.</p>	<p>In urban areas, the relatively greatest change would result from land use designations and regulations that allow increased densities, intensities, and building heights. Impacts would be greatest in designated centers, growth nodes, and along commercial corridors where infill development at higher densities would occur.</p> <p>Intermediate conversion of rural lands to urban compared to Alternatives 1 and 3. Conversion of rural to urban areas would occur primarily in the central and southern parts of the county, extend to the Gilberton community, and include area along Ilahee Road. LAMIRDs and rural villages would experience the same level of impact as under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>In urban areas, impacts would be intermediate to Alternatives 1 and 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u>. Changes would be similar to Alternative 2, <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u>, but at a lesser magnitude. Building heights would not increase, new Mixed Use zone and increased densities associated with high-density multifamily zoning would not occur. Potential for shadowing, a more urban appearance, and more light and glare in areas that are already urbanized would be greater than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 2.</p> <p>Greatest conversion of rural lands to urban designations, primarily in the central and southern parts of the county. Urban character would extend to Brownsville and Gilberton. More rural land between the City of Bremerton and the Gorst UGA would be converted to urban character, leaving minimal rural character between these two urban areas. Rural Wooded designation may help preserve some wooded areas. LAMIRDs or rural villages would experience the same level of</p>	<p><u>In urban areas, impacts would be similar to or somewhat less than Alternative 2. Change would result from land use designations and regulations that allow increased densities, intensities, and building heights. Impacts would be greatest in designated centers, growth nodes, and along commercial corridors where infill development at higher densities would occur.</u></p> <p><u>Conversion of rural lands to urban would be somewhat less than with Alternative 2. Conversion of rural to urban areas would occur primarily in the central and southern parts of the county, extend to the Gilberton community, and include area along Ilahee Road. Less rural land would be converted north of the Central Kitsap UGA and along Mile Hill Drive than under Alternative 2. LAMIRDs and rural villages would experience the same level of impact as under Alternative 1. Rural Wooded designation may help preserve some wooded areas.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Height, bulk, and scale compatibility—countywide	<p>In urban areas, there would be no change to potential for height, bulk, and scale compatibility impacts. Continued potential for compatibility impacts where more intensive residential or urban development is adjacent to development of a lesser scale and intensity, such as at the edges of UGA boundaries, or within UGAs where commercial development abuts residential.</p> <p>In the rural area, there would be no change from current potential for compatibility issues at the boundary with UGAs.</p>	<p>In urban areas, Alternative 2 would have the greatest potential for height, bulk, and scale compatibility impacts in some localized areas, as new and more intensive development occurs adjacent to existing less intensive development. Differences in the scale and bulk between growth nodes and lower-density areas outside growth nodes would be greater than under the other alternatives. Development intensity on Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program receiving sites could result in some localized compatibility issues.</p> <p>In the rural area, there would be greater potential for impacts in the current rural areas that are converted to urban designations and where new urban development may adjoin preexisting rural development. Also greater potential at urban-rural edges where more new more intensive urban designations adjoin rural designations.</p>	<p>impact as under Alternative 1.</p> <p>In urban areas, the potential for height, bulk, and scale impacts would be intermediate to Alternatives 1 and 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u> due to less upzoned area. However, impacts could occur at border of UGA expansion and rural areas and at some infill/redevelopment areas. Development intensity on TDR program receiving sites could result in some localized compatibility issues.</p> <p>In the rural area, Alternative 3 would have the greatest potential for impacts in the current rural areas that are converted to urban designations and where new urban development may adjoin preexisting rural development. Greatest potential for impacts at urban-rural edge due to larger urban/rural boundary and to increased density on rural properties participating in the reinstated Rural Wooded program. However, Rural Wooded policies would ensure visual buffers between clustered Rural Wooded uses and adjacent areas.</p>	<p><u>Similar to Alternative 2. However, in urban areas, the potential for height, bulk, and scale impacts would be somewhat less than Alternative 2 due to some changes in densities from Urban Low to Urban Restricted and Urban Reserve in Central Kitsap. Differences in the scale and bulk between growth nodes and lower-density areas outside growth nodes would affect somewhat fewer areas than under Alternative 2. Development intensity on TDR program receiving sites could result in some localized compatibility issues.</u></p> <p><u>In the rural area, there would be somewhat less potential for impacts in the current rural areas that are converted to urban designations and where new urban development may adjoin preexisting rural development, compared to Alternative 2. Somewhat less potential at urban-rural edges where more new more intensive urban designations adjoin rural designations than with Alternative 2 due to smaller urban/rural boundary, but somewhat greater potential within the rural areas due to increased density on rural</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Shade and shadows—countywide</b>	<p>In the urban area, there would be relatively lower amounts of shadow and shade over smaller area.</p> <p>In the rural area there would be no significant shade and shadow impacts.</p>	<p>In the urban area, Alternative 2 would have the greatest potential for shade and shadow impacts, due to larger building scale in growth nodes and more areas of upzoning.</p> <p>In the rural area there would be potential for shade and shadow impacts in rural conversion areas and at urban-rural edge.</p>	<p>In the urban area this alternative would have the potential for impacts in largest geographic area compared to other alternatives, but relatively less potential for localized impacts than Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> because of lower building heights and relatively less infill development.</p> <p>In the rural area this alternative would have the greatest potential for shade and shadow impacts due to largest UGA expansion and urban/rural boundary.</p>	<p><u>properties participating in the reinstated Rural Wooded program. However, Rural Wooded policies would ensure visual buffers between clustered Rural Wooded uses and adjacent areas.</u></p> <p><u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with the potential for shade and shadow impacts affecting somewhat less area, due to somewhat fewer areas of upzoning in Central Kitsap.</u></p> <p><u>In the rural area there would be somewhat lower potential for shade and shadow impacts in rural conversion areas and at urban-rural edge than with Alternative 2, due to smaller urban/rural boundary.</u></p>
<b>Light and glare—countywide</b>	<p>In the urban area there would be increased levels of light and glare from both mobile and stationary sources. Impacts would most likely occur in areas nearest existing urban or urbanizing areas.</p> <p>In the rural area there would be some spillover light from urban areas and increased light and glare associated with increased traffic due to overall growth.</p>	<p>In the urban area there would be greater increases than under Alternative 1 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u>, and the greatest potential for impacts in growth nodes and other infill areas.</p> <p>Rural areas that are converted to urban uses would experience the greatest increases in light and glare. Greater potential for increased light and glare spillover from urban to rural areas due to increased</p>	<p>In the urban area, localized impacts would be similar to those of Alternative 2. Greatest potential for cumulative increase in light and glare due to largest urban area.</p> <p>In the rural area, this alternative would have the greatest potential for light and glare effects due to most expanded UGAs and highest level of growth and associated traffic.</p>	<p><u>In the urban area there would be somewhat smaller increases than under Alternative 2, and the potential for impacts in growth nodes and other infill areas would affect somewhat less area.</u></p> <p><u>Rural areas that are converted to urban uses would experience the greatest increases in light and glare, but somewhat less area would be affected than under Alternative 2. Similar potential to Alternative 2 for</u></p>



Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
		development intensity in urban areas.		<u>increased light and glare spillover from urban to rural areas due to increased development intensity in urban areas.</u>
<b>Vegetation, views, and open space—countywide</b>	In the urban area, the amount of vacant land within the UGAs would be reduced over time, resulting in cumulative impacts, including loss of vegetation and replacement with buildings, landscaping, and increased impervious surfaces.	In the urban area, there would be generally greater impacts than under Alternative 1 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> , with expanded UGA boundaries. The Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGA boundaries would contract at their joint boundary in the Barker Creek corridor, reducing development impacts and preserving some existing vegetation and open space.	In the urban area, this alternative would have the greatest impacts on natural vegetation, with most expanded UGA boundaries. Contiguous open space areas located in these expansion areas may become fragmented.	<u>In the urban area, there would be generally somewhat lesser impacts than under Alternative 2, with somewhat less expansion of UGA boundaries. The Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGA boundaries would contract at their joint boundary in the Barker Creek corridor, reducing development impacts and preserving some existing vegetation and open space.</u>
	Views may increase in areas that are cleared of vegetation, while other views may be blocked by new buildings.	Impacts on views would be similar to those under Alternative 1. In addition, views of mountains and waterways could be affected in some localized areas due to more intense building at greater heights and densities.	Same as Alternative 2.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	There would be minimal changes to views from highways.	There would be greater changes to views from highways as they enter and cross through urban areas, particularly along SR 3 in the Silverdale UGA. Views from urban highway segments would change to a more intensive urban character, and SR 3 would pass through more area of single-family residential character.	Impacts on highway views would be similar to those of Alternative 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u> , although more of SR 3 that is currently in the rural area would extend through and have views of urban areas, primarily low-density residential.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Existing development patterns would continue to have potential impacts on views to the water and shoreline vegetation.	There would be greater changes in shoreline views, including views from downtown Silverdale, the west side of Dyes Inlet to Chico Bay, at Gilberton, <del>and Brownsville</del> , on Rocky Point, and on Sinclair inlet in West Bremerton. Less potential for view blockage in south Ilahee area, but more somewhat more potential along Ilahee Road north toward Gilberton, where more shoreline would be included in the UGAs.	Alternative 3 would affect more shoreline views because more shoreline (than under Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> ) would be developed with urban uses, including the Brownsville community.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>	
In the rural area, open space in the form of pastures and forests would become more fragmented with rural development, and overall open space would decrease.	There would be greater reduction in open space in rural areas due to expansion of urban areas. The TDR program could result in preservation of rural open space at participating rural properties.	Alternative 3 would cause the greatest reduction in rural area due to greatest UGA expansion. The TDR program could result in preservation of rural open space at participating rural properties. Additionally, Rural Wooded designation could help preserve wooded areas.	<u>There would be somewhat less reduction in open space in rural areas than under Alternative 2 due to somewhat less expansion of urban areas. The TDR program could result in preservation of rural open space at participating rural properties. Additionally, Rural Wooded Incentive Program could help preserve wooded areas.</u>	
<b>Visual character—Silverdale sub-area</b>	Continued urbanization based on adopted land use designations; changes in visual character would occur as vacant land is developed. Impacts would be greatest in designated centers where infill development at higher densities would occur. Urban Restricted development would be permitted in a portion of the Barker Creek	Changes in downtown area could include new mixed use development, greater intensity of commercial uses, and continuation of regional commercial development. Changes outside of downtown would include conversion to more intensive business uses west of SR 3 and conversion of rural lands to single-family uses in expanded UGA areas to the	Similar to Alternative 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u> in downtown Silverdale. Outside of downtown, largest conversion of rural to urban area and including more commercial character north of SR 3. The Clear Creek and Barker Creek corridors would convert to urban uses, although portions would be designated Urban Restricted.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 in downtown Silverdale but with somewhat more conversion to mixed use development. Changes outside of downtown would be similar to Alternative 2, with a similar amount of conversion of rural lands to urban uses. The rural character of the Barker Creek corridor would be preserved. Area</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
	corridor.	northeast and southwest, including portions of the Clear Creek and Chico Creek areas. The rural character of the Barker Creek corridor would be preserved. Area near the mouth of Chico Creek at Dyes Inlet would also be converted to urban designations.		<u>near the mouth of Chico Creek at Dyes Inlet would also be converted to urban designations.</u>
<b>Height, bulk, and scale compatibility—Silverdale sub-area</b>	No change to potential for height, bulk, and scale compatibility impacts. Continued potential for compatibility impacts where commercial and residential development are adjacent, typically in the downtown portion of Silverdale. Design guidelines for downtown Silverdale would not be adopted.	Greatest potential for impacts <u>than Alternative 3</u> in downtown Silverdale adjacent to new Mixed Use designations and next to Regional Commercial designations. Design guidelines would be adopted for downtown Silverdale, which could help ensure compatibility.	Same as Alternative 2 in and adjacent to portions of downtown Silverdale and in areas north and west of SR 3, and greater impacts where UGA boundaries are expanded to change rural areas to urban and at the new urban-rural edge. Design guidelines would not be adopted. In addition, potential compatibility impacts in the northwest portion of the expanded UGA adjacent to the Trident Naval Air Station.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with somewhat greater area converting to mixed use. Design guidelines would be adopted for downtown Silverdale, which could help ensure compatibility.</u>
<b>Sub-area shade and shadows—Silverdale sub-area</b>	Relatively low potential for shadow and shade impacts.	Greater building heights and densities in the downtown area could result in greater shade and shadow impacts in the new Mixed Use area, as well as on properties of a lower intensity that are adjacent to properties of a higher intensity. Design guidelines for the downtown could reduce some effects.	Lower potential for impacts in the downtown area than Alternative 2 based on lower building heights, but greater potential than Alternative 1.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2. Greater building heights and densities in the downtown area could result in greater shade and shadow impacts in the new Mixed Use area, which would be somewhat larger than with Alternative 2, as well as on properties of a lower intensity that are adjacent to properties of a higher intensity. However, there would be somewhat less potential for impacts in the western</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Sub-area light and glare—Silverdale sub-area</b>	Relatively lower increases in light and glare in the Silverdale sub-area.	Potentially greatest increases in light and glare in downtown Silverdale, and somewhat greater in other areas of Silverdale than under Alternative 1. Alternatively, depending on the degree to which the area transitions to a more pedestrian-oriented environment in the Mixed Use area, a reduction in vehicular and parking lot lighting may result.	Greatest effects over largest area; however, increases in the Mixed Use portion of downtown Silverdale could be somewhat lower than under Alternative 2.	<u>(Industrial) and northeastern portions of the sub-area. Design guidelines for the downtown could reduce some effects.</u>  <u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with somewhat greater increases in light and glare in downtown Silverdale, and somewhat less potential for light and glare impacts in the western portion of the UGA where residential development would not be surrounded by industrial. Alternatively, depending on the degree to which the area transitions to a more pedestrian-oriented environment in the Mixed Use area, a reduction in vehicular and parking lot lighting may result.</u>
<b>Vegetation, views, and open space—Silverdale sub-area</b>	Vacant land would be reduced over time, resulting in loss of vegetation and replacement with buildings, landscaping, and increased impervious surfaces. Views may increase in areas that are cleared of vegetation, while other views may be blocked by new buildings. Minimal changes to views from highways. Continuation of existing development patterns along the shoreline, and continued potential for impacts on views to the water and shoreline vegetation.	With more intensive development in the sub-area, views of the Olympic Mountains, Dyes Inlet, and the wooded ridgelines surrounding the downtown area could be obstructed from some localized areas due to increased building heights and densities. In the downtown area, vegetation in the form of street trees and landscaping may increase as a result of redevelopment under design guidelines. Open space in the form of public plazas and pocket parks could also increase as a result of development standards	There would be lower potential for view blockage in the downtown area than Alternative 2 based on lower building heights, although no design guidelines would be adopted to reduce potential view impacts, but greater potential than Alternative 1. Alternative 3 has the greatest potential for obstruction of shoreline views outside downtown, since more shoreline would be included in the UGA. Near Chico Bay the densities would be a little higher than for Alternative 2.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with somewhat greater potential for view obstruction in the downtown due to somewhat more Mixed Use area.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:	and design guidelines applied within downtown. Greater potential for obstruction of shoreline views because more shoreline would be included in the UGA, including at Chico Bay.		
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Area-specific Design Guidelines that address site design and landscaping could be applied in areas where higher-intensity development is occurring to ensure compatibility with existing development, create an inviting pedestrian environment in dense centers and growth nodes, minimize height and bulk impacts, and preserve the visual character currently apparent throughout the county.</li> <li>▪ Landscaping and tree retention regulations for commercial development and residential subdivisions could be developed or enhanced to ensure that new development includes trees of varied age and native vegetation to reduce the impacts of new development.</li> <li>▪ Lighting codes could be enhanced or developed to reduce offsite impacts of light and glare from commercial development.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	The amount and level of development will increase between the current year and 2025, irrevocably committing land to allowed uses and activities. The extent to which the visual character of Kitsap County is affected is subjective and will depend on the values and preferences of those viewing the change; the quality of architectural and urban design features that are incorporated into the development; and how well the image presented by the overall scale and form of development incorporates features of the local setting.			

### 1.8.6. Transportation

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Lane-miles of countywide roadway	2, 266 lane-miles of county roadway (0.9% more than existing).	2, 266 lane-miles of county roadway (0.9% more than existing).	2, 266 lane-miles of county roadway (0.9% more than existing).	<u>2,262 lane-miles of county roadway (0.7% more than existing).</u>
Average daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) countywide	6,921,640 daily VMT (40% more than existing).	7,299,470 daily VMT (48% more than existing).	8,005,100 daily VMT (62% more than existing).	<u>7,389,710 daily VMT (50% more than existing).</u>
Average daily vehicle trips countywide	749,756 vehicle trips per day (36% more than existing).	834,942 vehicle trips per day (51% more than existing).	884,790 vehicle trips per day (60% more than existing).	<u>828,633 (50% more than existing)</u>
Average daily rideshare vehicle trips countywide	17,242 rideshare trips per day (2.3% of daily vehicle trips).	20,511 rideshare trips per day (2.5% of daily vehicle trips).	21,880 rideshare trips per day (2.5% of daily vehicle trips).	<u>20,225 rideshare trips per day (2.5% of daily vehicle trips).</u>
Daily transit person trips countywide	12,271 transit person trips per day (59% more than existing).	12,169 transit person trips per day (58% more than existing).	12,267 transit person trips per day (59% more than existing).	<u>12,099 transit person trips per day (57% more than existing).</u>
Roadway segment operations countywide	Roadway segment operations are measured by projected LOS under 2025 build-out conditions. Roadway segments are considered deficient if the ratio of traffic volume to roadway capacity (V/C) exceeds the adopted County standard of V/C=0.89 for arterial and collector roadways within UGAs, and V/C=0.79 for all other roadways.			
	Lane-miles (ln-mi) of <b>deficient</b> roadways projected under 2025 build-out:	Lane-miles (ln-mi) of <b>deficient</b> roadways projected under 2025 build-out:	Lane-miles (ln-mi) of <b>deficient</b> roadways projected under 2025 build-out:	<u>Lane-miles (ln-mi) of <b>deficient</b> roadways projected under 2025 build-out:</u>
	North county ~ 26.9 ln-mi	North county ~ 30.3 ln-mi	North county ~ 29.2 ln-mi	<u>North county ~ 29.3 ln-mi</u>
	Central county ~7.3 ln-mi	Central county ~ 9.2 ln-mi	Central county ~ 18.5 ln-mi	<u>Central county ~ 14.3 ln-mi</u>
	<u>South county ~ 41.4 ln-mi</u>	<u>South county ~ 51.8 ln-mi</u>	<u>South county ~ 72.9 ln-mi</u>	<u>South county ~ 62.5 ln-mi</u>
	Countywide ~ 75.6 ln-mi	Countywide ~ 91.3 ln-mi	Countywide ~ 120.6 ln-mi	<u>Countywide ~ 106.1 ln-mi</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	<p>Locations of deficient segments under this alternative are shown in Figure 3.2-17 in <a href="#">DEIS</a> Chapter 3. Approximately 11.7% of total lane-miles of functionally classified county roadways are projected to be deficient by 2025 under build-out of Alternative 1. This is below the County's concurrency threshold of 15%, so would not trigger concurrency under the current adopted policy.</p>	<p>Locations of deficient segments under this alternative are shown in Figure 3.2-18 in <a href="#">DEIS</a> Chapter 3. Approximately 14.1% of total lane-miles of functionally classified county roadways are projected to be deficient by 2025 under build-out of Alternative 2. This is below the County's concurrency threshold of 15%, so would not trigger concurrency under the current adopted policy.</p>	<p>Locations of deficient segments under this alternative are shown in Figure 3.2-19 in <a href="#">DEIS</a> Chapter 3. Approximately 18.6% of total lane-miles of functionally classified county roadways are projected to be deficient by 2025 under build-out of Alternative 3. This exceeds the County's concurrency threshold of 15%, so would trigger concurrency under the current adopted policy.</p>	<p><u>Locations of deficient segments under this alternative are shown in Figure 3.2-3 in <a href="#">FEIS</a> Chapter 3. Approximately 16.4% of total lane-miles of functionally classified county roadways are projected to be deficient by 2025 under build-out of the Preferred Alternative. This is above the County's concurrency threshold of 15%, so would trigger concurrency under the current adopted policy.</u></p>
<p><b>Intersection operations—countywide</b></p>	<p>LOS designations are qualitative measures of congestion that describe operational conditions at an intersection, based on factors such as volume and average delay. LOS is represented by letter grades A through F. LOS A through C imply traffic flows with minimal to medium delay, while LOS D and E imply conditions that approach capacity, and LOS F implies unstable flow with potential for substantial delays.</p> <p>The County does not have adopted LOS standards for intersections. It is generally accepted in industry practice that LOS E and LOS F represent congested operations.</p> <p>For purposes of analysis presented in the DEIS, impacts are identified if the following analysis thresholds are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Signalized intersections – operating at LOS E or LOS F.</li> <li>▪ Stop controlled intersections – one or more stop-controlled intersection legs operating at LOS F with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</li> </ul>			
	<p>Number of signalized intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F by 2025: <b>4</b></p> <p>Number of stop-controlled intersections projected to have one or more stop controlled operating at LOS F with average delay &gt;180 seconds by 2025: <b>5</b></p>	<p>Number of signalized intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F by 2025: <b>5</b></p> <p>Number of stop-controlled intersections projected to have one or more stop controlled operating at LOS F with average delay &gt;180 seconds by 2025: <b>6</b></p>	<p>Number of signalized intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F by 2025: <b>6</b></p> <p>Number of stop-controlled intersections projected to have one or more stop controlled operating at LOS F with average delay &gt;180 seconds by 2025: <b>10</b></p>	<p><u>Number of signalized intersections projected to operate at LOS E or F by 2025: <b>5</b></u></p> <p><u>Number of stop-controlled intersections projected to have one or more stop controlled operating at LOS F with average delay &gt;180 seconds by 2025: <b>5</b></u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
State highway deficiencies—countywide	LOS on state highway segments projected by 2025 under each of the three alternatives are based upon a congestion index (ratio of Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) over the Capacity (C) of the highway). Rural highways are considered if they exceed a standard of LOS C; urban highways are considered deficient if they exceed the standard of LOS D. Approximately 100 miles of state highway (varying in width between 2 lanes and 6 lanes) run through Kitsap County. Analysis completed for the DEIS reflects approximately 130 lane-miles of capacity improvement to state highways, as identified in the Washington Transportation Plan. If any of the improvements to state highways defined in the WTP are not constructed, this could result in additional deficiencies on state highways; and potentially higher volumes and additional deficiencies on county and city roadways.			
	Length of Deficient Segments: 31.5 miles (approximately 31% of total miles)	Length of Deficient Segments: 36.8 miles (approximately 37% of total miles)	Length of Deficient Segments: 36.8 miles (approximately 37% of total miles)	<u>Length of Deficient Segments: 34.9 miles (approximately 34.7% of total miles)</u>
Total number of roadway improvement locations—countywide	<del>30-32</del> roadway segments	<del>35-36</del> roadway segments	56 roadway segments	<u>46 roadway segments</u>
Mitigation Cost—countywide (2006 dollars)	<p>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs were completed for projects identified to address roadway deficiencies projected under Alternative 1. They are summarized as follows:</p> <p>North county \$35,011,000            Central county \$51,099,000            South county \$119,808,000 <u>to \$129,074,000</u>            Total \$205,910,000 <u>to \$215,184,000</u></p>	<p>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs were completed for projects identified to address roadway deficiencies projected under Alternative 2. They are summarized as follows:</p> <p>North county \$79,428,000            Central county \$88,071,000            South county \$133,862,000 <u>to \$143,136,000</u>            Total \$301,361,000 <u>to \$310,635,000</u></p>	<p>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs were completed for projects identified to address roadway deficiencies projected under Alternative 3. They are summarized as follows:</p> <p>North county \$97,667,000            Central county \$104,139,000            South county \$177,019,000            Total \$378,825,000</p>	<p><u>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs were completed for projects identified to address roadway deficiencies projected under the Preferred Alternative. They are summarized as follows:</u></p> <p><u>North county \$89,711,000</u>  <u>Central county \$96,551,000</u>  <u>South county \$135,850,000</u>  <u>Total \$322,112,000</u></p>
Projected revenue (2006 dollars)—countywide	\$28,825,132	\$28,825,132	\$28,825,132	<u>\$28,825,132</u>



Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Revenue shortfall (2006 dollars)—countywide	(\$177,084,868- <del>\$186,358,868</del> )	(\$272,535,868- <del>281,809,868</del> )	(\$349,999.868)	<u>(\$293,286,868)</u>
Transportation—Silverdale sub-area	<p>In the Silverdale sub-area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ 6.0 lane-miles of deficient roadways projected under 2025 build-out of Alternative 1.</li> <li>2 intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F under 2025 build-out of Alternative 1.</li> <li>1 stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at LOS with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</li> <li>7 roadway segments projected to need improvement by 2025.</li> <li>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs in the Silverdale sub-area under Alternative 1 are \$67,018,000.</li> </ul>	<p>In the Silverdale sub-area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ 7.7 lane-miles of deficient roadways projected under 2025 build-out of Alternative <del>1</del><u>2</u>.</li> <li>3 intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F under 2025 build-out of Alternative 2.</li> <li>1 stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at LOS with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</li> <li><del>12</del><u>9</u> roadway segments projected to need improvement by 2025.</li> <li>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs in the Silverdale sub-area under Alternative <del>1</del><u>2</u> are \$120,266,000.</li> </ul>	<p>In the Silverdale sub-area,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>~ 10.3 lane-miles of deficient roadways projected under 2025 build-out of Alternative 3.</li> <li>3 intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F under 2025 build-out of Alternative 3.</li> <li>1 stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at LOS with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</li> <li><del>14</del><u>12</u> roadway segments projected to need improvement by 2025.</li> <li>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs in the Silverdale sub-area under Alternative 3 are \$151,110,000.</li> </ul>	<p><u>In the Silverdale sub-area,</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>~ 9.5 lane-miles of deficient roadways projected under 2025 build-out of Preferred Alternative.</u></li> <li><u>3 intersections are projected to operate at LOS E or F under 2025 build-out of Preferred Alternative.</u></li> <li><u>1 stop-controlled intersection is projected to operate at LOS with average delay greater than 180 seconds.</u></li> <li><u>9 roadway segments projected to need improvement by 2025.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Planning-level estimates of transportation improvement costs in the Silverdale sub-area under Preferred Alternative are \$120,266,000.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Countywide for all alternatives, mitigation measures address a list of recommended improvements, policy measures such as concurrency to ensure that facilities are in place for new development or a reassessment of funding or land use is made, as well as programmatic measures such as commute trip reduction, access management, transit compatible design, etc. See <a href="#">DEIS Table 3.2-122</a> and <a href="#">FEIS Table 3.2-18</a> for potential strategies to achieve balance between Transportation LOS, Financing, and Land Use.</li> <li>▪ Under Alternative 2 <a href="#">and the Preferred Alternative</a>, the County should require new development under the SEPA Mixed Use/Infill Categorical Exemption in Silverdale to provide a traffic analysis that indicates how many trips the development would generate, for all new development proposed under this exemption. Development will be allowed under this exemption up to the point that all of the trips in the trip bank have been taken.</li> <li>▪ Under Alternatives 1, 2, <a href="#">the Preferred</a> and 3, amend the KCC to give the County discretion to require that a traffic impact analysis study be completed for any development proposal countywide that the Director of Public Works determines could have potentially significant effects on traffic operations on county roadways, regardless of SEPA exemption or concurrency status.</li> <li>▪ Under Alternatives 1, 2 and 3 <a href="#">and the Preferred</a>, amend the KCC to define the area of impact for proposed developments, so that the concurrency test may be applied on a sub-area basis.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>Implementation of any of the growth alternatives will result in increased traffic within the County, with the lowest increase occurring under the No-Action Alternative, and the greatest increase occurring under Alternative 3. Although the effects of additional vehicles on traffic congestion can be mitigated to varying degrees through the recommended transportation improvements, the actual increase in traffic is considered a significant unavoidable adverse impact.</p>			

### 1.8.7. Noise

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Construction noise—countywide</b>	Daytime construction noise is exempt from noise limits specified by the Kitsap County Code. New daytime construction could cause temporary, localized noise impacts at existing homes near the construction site. Nighttime construction would be subject to the County's noise limits, so it would not be allowed to cause noise impacts at existing homes.	Same as Alternative 1; the local noise code would generally minimize potential noise impacts. However, greater UGA expansion (35% more than Alternative 1) could lead to more construction sites and a higher potential for occasional impacts.	Same as Alternative 1; the local noise code would generally minimize potential noise impacts. However, greater UGA expansion (50% more than Alternative 1) could lead to more construction sites and a higher potential for occasional impacts.	<u>Same as Alternative 1; the local noise code would generally minimize potential noise impacts. However, greater UGA expansion (33% more than Alternative 1) could lead to more construction sites and a higher potential for occasional impacts.</u>
<b>Noise from new commercial or industrial facilities—countywide</b>	New commercial or industrial facilities would be subject to noise limits specified by the County noise code, so they would not be allowed to cause noise impacts at existing homes.	Same as Alternative 1; the County noise code would generally minimize potential impacts. However, increases in employment compared to Alternative 1 could result in more local facilities with the potential to cause noise impact.	Same as Alternative 1; the County noise code would generally minimize potential impacts. However, increases in employment greater than Alternative 1 or Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> could result in more local facilities with the potential to cause noise impact.	<u>Same as Alternative 1; the County noise code would generally minimize potential impacts. However, increases in employment compared to Alternative 1 (but slightly less than Alternative 2) could result in more local facilities with the potential to cause noise impact.</u>
<b>Traffic noise—countywide</b>	Homes near high-speed and/or high-volume arterials or freeways could be affected by noise. State and federal regulations would require the County and cities to consider traffic noise abatement for roadway projects funded by state or federal programs. Traffic noise abatement would not be required for roadway projects	This alternative would result in a higher population density than Alternative 1, so it could result in more homes being subjected to significant traffic noise.	This alternative would result in a higher population density than Alternatives 1 or 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> , so it could result in more homes being subjected to significant traffic noise.	<u>This alternative would result in a higher population density than Alternative 1, and a similar population density as Alternative 2, so it could result in more homes being subjected to significant traffic noise.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Airport noise—Bremerton National</b>	<p>constructed using only local funding.</p> <p>The Bremerton National Airport would be surrounded by planned industrial uses in the immediate area, and further out by rural residential uses. With implementation of the Airport Master Plan, noise impacts are not anticipated to be significant.</p>	<p>The Bremerton National Airport would be surrounded by planned industrial or employment/recreational (IMPRA) uses in the immediate area, and further out by rural residential uses. With implementation of the Airport Master Plan, noise impacts are not anticipated to be significant.</p>	<p>The Bremerton National Airport would be surrounded by planned industrial uses in the immediate area. Beyond the planned industrial uses, Alternative 3 would result in an added area of Urban Restricted land that may allow additional homes at greater than rural residential densities; such homes would be subject to greater noise levels. This could increase the potential for noise conflicts caused by general aviation overflights near dwellings. This alternative would have greater potential for impacts on residential uses than Alternatives 1 or 2.</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>
<b>Noise—Silverdale sub-area</b>	<p>Existing and added residents may experience greater noise due to increased traffic. The KCC noise code would prevent new commercial and industrial facilities from causing noise impacts. The UGA boundary would not expand next to Apex Airpark as proposed under Alternatives 2 and 3, and therefore Alternative 1 would have less potential for impacts in terms of airport noise and compatibility for future residents.</p>	<p>Under Alternative 2 there would be twice as many new residents and homes as under Alternative 1. There would also be nearly twice the number of jobs as Alternative 1. This growth would increase traffic and associated noise. Code requirements are similar as described for Alternative 1.</p> <p>Under Alternative 2, the area surrounding Apex Airpark near would remain outside the UGA, but the UGA would expand and be</p>	<p>Under Alternative 3 there would be more than four times as many new residents and homes as Alternative 1. There would also be more new jobs, similar to Alternative 2 levels. This would increase growth and traffic related noise. Code requirements are similar as described for Alternative 1.</p> <p>More potential impact than the other alternatives, because the UGA boundary would be expanded to allow new dwellings near Apex</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 2.</u></p>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A reduction in environmental noise attributable to traffic would be anticipated if VMT were reduced. Higher density development allows transit to serve people more efficiently and generally results in fewer VMT per person. Conversely, uniform development would likely result in longer commutes, the maximum VMT, and greater environmental noise.</li> <li>▪ Commercial land uses and public facilities can function as buffers between industrial and residential land uses because they are generally quieter than industrial sources and less noise-sensitive than residential land uses. Land use and development decisions should require careful consideration about the impacts of adjacent land uses on receiving properties.</li> <li>▪ Kitsap County could adopt standard construction noise measures that apply to all new construction projects. For developments allowed under the Comprehensive Plan, construction and demolition noise could be reduced through techniques such as enclosures or walls, substituting quieter equipment or construction methods, minimizing time of operation, and locating equipment farther from sensitive receptors.</li> <li>▪ The County noise code currently exempts the most significant noise source in the county (traffic noise originating from public roads). Federal/state traffic noise abatement regulations apply only to roadway improvement projects that use state or federal funding. Thus, there is no current regulatory mechanism that requires the County to consider traffic noise abatement for County-funded roadway improvement projects. To address this, the County could revise its noise code to adopt traffic noise abatement requirements (e.g., WSDOT's State-Wide Traffic Noise Analysis, Abatement Policy &amp; Procedures) to apply to County-funded roadway improvement projects.</li> <li>▪ Planting buffer zones of vegetation along roadways and stationary noise sources could reduce noise annoyance psychologically by removing noise sources from view; however, it would not substantially reduce actual noise levels unless the buffer zones were at least 50 to 100 feet wide.</li> <li>▪ Increased transportation system management (TSM) and transportation demand management (TDM) measures could be implemented to reduce the number of single-occupancy vehicles and trips. Reducing the number of high trip rate uses and allowing for compatible mixed uses could also help reduce trips. Any reduction in traffic would correspondingly decrease traffic noise levels.</li> <li>▪ Traffic management measures could also reduce roadway noise levels. Such measures could consist of prohibition of certain types of vehicles in certain areas or at certain times, such as on roads adjacent to a park. Also, road alignments could be changed in conjunction with planned zoning and development to facilitate quieter residential areas.</li> <li>▪ If construction of new dwellings is proposed near busy roads, the County could require that such dwellings include appropriate acoustical mitigation</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>(e.g., noise-attenuating building materials) to minimize traffic noise impacts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Alternative 3 in particular, and to a smaller degree under Alternative 2 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u>, could be revised to reduce UGA boundary in the vicinity of the Apex Airpark.</li> </ul> <p>Under all alternatives, some existing and future residents would likely be subjected to traffic noise levels that exceed FHWA's noise abatement criteria used to define traffic noise impacts. In some cases, traffic noise abatement might not be technically feasible or reasonable based on cost-effectiveness considerations.</p>			

## 1.9. Built Environment: Public Services and Utilities

### 1.9.1. Public Buildings

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Countywide	Growth would result in increased need for government facilities and associated operations and maintenance staff, including administrative offices, maintenance facilities, superior courtrooms, and community centers. The need would be for new facilities or expansion of existing facilities.	Greater facilities needs than Alternative 1. The need for administrative office space would be approximately 26% greater than that of Alternative 1 based on existing LOS standards. Other facility needs would be somewhat greater than with Alternative 1.	Greatest increase in facilities needs. The need for administrative office space would be 84% greater than Alternative 1, and 46% more than Alternative 2. Other facility needs would be greater than under Alternatives 1 and 2.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	Construction of new facilities would require the County to acquire additional property, depending on where the specific need is located.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	The need for additional community center space would be most concentrated in the Central Kitsap and ULID #6 UGAs due to the population growth that would occur in those areas.	Alternative 2 would entail greater need, most pronounced in the Port Orchard and ULID #6 UGAs, followed by the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs.	Alternative 3 would entail the greatest need, most pronounced in the Silverdale UGA, followed by the Port Orchard, ULID #6, and Central Kitsap UGAs.	<u>The Preferred Alternative would entail similar need to Alternative 2 in the ULID #6 UGA, somewhat greater need in the Port Orchard UGA, and somewhat less need in the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs than with Alternative 2.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	Need for additional maintenance facilities may occur in specific areas of higher growth including the Central Kitsap and ULID #6 UGAs.	This alternative would entail greater need in the Port Orchard and ULID #6 UGAs, as well as in the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs.	Alternative 3 would entail the greatest need in the Silverdale UGA, as well as the Port Orchard, ULID #6, and Central Kitsap UGAs.	<u>The Preferred Alternative would entail similar need to Alternative 2 in the ULID #6 UGA, somewhat greater need in the Port Orchard UGA, and somewhat less need in the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs than with Alternative 2.</u>
Silverdale sub-area	There would be increased demand for community center space. Use of other facilities would also increase.	Same as Alternative 1 but with more than twice the population increase.	Same as Alternative 2 but with more than twice the population increase.	<u>Same as Alternative 1 but with almost twice the population increase.</u>
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The County could coordinate with non-County facility providers including cities and special purpose districts to provide community center facilities in areas of greatest need.</li> <li>▪ If determining impact fees for parks and recreation facilities, the County could ensure that impacts on community centers are incorporated into fees.</li> <li>▪ The County could consider co-location of government agencies and uses to reduce the costs of new facilities.</li> </ul>			
Significant unavoidable adverse impacts	With advanced planning, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts on public buildings would be anticipated within the range of alternatives reviewed.			



## 1.9.2. Fire Protection

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1: (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Countywide	Upgrades to water systems would be needed to achieve adequate fire flow in some small water systems serving new development in the Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue outside the Silverdale Water District, North Perry Water District, Public Utility District #1, and Bremerton Water Department. Depending on the ability of the water districts to plan for growth, the need for upgrades could occur in other water districts as well.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
	Demand for fire protection and emergency medical service (EMS), including staffing and equipment, would increase less than under Alternatives 2 or 3. The greatest demand increase would occur in the South Kitsap Fire District.	Greater increase in demand than under Alternative 1. Greatest increase would be in the South Kitsap Fire District, followed by the Central Kitsap Fire District.	Greatest increase in demand. Greatest increase would be in the Central Kitsap Fire District, followed by the South Kitsap Fire District.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	Increased infill development would allow for greater efficiency of services.	Greatest efficiencies would be achieved within existing UGA boundaries, compared to Alternatives 1 and 3.	Similar efficiencies to Alternative 2 with infill but to a lesser degree in downtown Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and East Bremerton, offset by larger UGA boundaries and more dispersed development in Silverdale and Port Orchard.	<u>Similar efficiencies to Alternative 2 with infill but to a somewhat greater degree in downtown Silverdale and the Port Orchard UGA, and to a somewhat lesser degree in Central Kitsap, offset by somewhat smaller UGA boundaries.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1: (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Silverdale sub-area	Part of the Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue District. Infill would increase demand but also allow for greater efficiency of services.	Same as Alternative 1 but with about twice the amount of growth.	Same as Alternative 2 but with more than twice the amount of growth for the greatest increase in demand for services. Also the largest expansion of UGA, resulting in less efficiency than Alternatives 1 or 2.	<u>Same as Alternative 1 but with almost twice the amount of growth.</u>
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expanded fire and emergency medical services could be provided concurrent with new development.</li> <li>▪ With the exception of the Silverdale Mixed Use/Infill exemption area under Alternative 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u>, which is limited in location and analyzed in this DEIS at a focused level, specific impacts of future development proposals should be assessed and appropriate mitigation measures imposed through the County's SEPA authority. These may include impact fees, building access and lighting, right-of-way access, and other measures to support rapid emergency response.</li> <li>▪ The County could adopt fire impact mitigation fees and apply them through SEPA or land use permits.</li> </ul>			
Significant unavoidable adverse impacts	Future population growth and development will continue to increase the need for fire protection/EMS services under any alternative.			

### 1.9.3. Law Enforcement

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Countywide	Demand for law enforcement will increase, but to a relatively lesser degree than under Alternatives 2 or 3.	Greater increase in demand than Alternative 1.	Greatest increase in demand.	<u>Similar increase in demand to Alternative 2.</u>
	Increased densities would allow for increased efficiency of service by allowing for smaller patrol areas and faster response times; however, efficiencies would be less than under Alternative 2.	Greatest efficiencies would be achieved within existing UGA boundaries compared to Alternatives 1 and 3.	Similar but lesser efficiencies than Alternative 2 in downtown Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and East Bremerton. Greater efficiencies in Port Orchard along corridors. Greater efficiencies offset to some degree by larger UGA boundaries and more dispersed development overall than Alternatives 1 or 2.	<u>Similar but somewhat lesser efficiencies than Alternative 2 in Central Kitsap, and somewhat greater efficiencies in Port Orchard along corridors. Lesser efficiencies offset to some degree by somewhat smaller UGA boundaries than Alternative 2.</u>
	Additional staffing would be required. Population growth in unincorporated county would require 37 additional deputies and 27 corrections officers to maintain 2005 staffing levels.	Greater staffing requirements than under Alternative 1. Population growth in unincorporated county would require 43 additional deputies and 31 corrections officers to maintain 2005 staffing levels.	Greatest need for increased staffing. Population growth in unincorporated county would require 57 additional deputies and 41 corrections officers to maintain 2005 staffing levels.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	Additional correctional facilities capacity would be required. The demand for law enforcement services would be greatest in areas served by the Main and Central Sheriff's offices.	Greater expansions would likely be required. Need would occur in areas served by Main and Central Sheriff's offices.	Greatest need for expanded facilities. Need would occur in areas served by Main and Central Sheriff's offices.	<u>Similar to Alternative 2 but with somewhat greater need in areas served by the Main Sheriff's Office and somewhat less need in areas served by the Central Sheriff's Office.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	Sheriff's patrol office is located in Silverdale. Least increase in demand of the alternatives. Increased urbanization could increase efficiencies.	Same as Alternative 1 but with more than twice the amount of growth resulting in greater increase in demand for services. Greater efficiencies in service than Alternatives 1 and 3 in downtown Silverdale.	Similar efficiency in downtown Silverdale, as Alternative 2 but with more than twice the amount of growth in remainder of UGA for the greatest increase in demand for services. Also the largest UGA expansion for less efficiency than Alternatives 1 or 2.	<u>Same as Alternative 1 but with nearly twice the amount of growth resulting in greater increase in demand for services. Somewhat greater efficiencies in service than Alternative 2 in downtown Silverdale.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Expanded law enforcement services should be provided concurrent with new development. Measures such as building access and lighting, right-of-way access, and other measures may help to deter crime and facilitate response time.</li> <li>▪ Staffing will need to be increased as population increases. However, as urban areas are annexed, personnel and/or facilities may need to transfer to the annexing city.</li> <li>▪ Building and site designs known as Crime Prevention through Enhanced Design (CPTED) that would reduce opportunities for crimes to occur could be encouraged through regulations, as would adequate street lighting for residential and commercial development.</li> <li>▪ Development of community crime prevention programs could also help mitigate some of the impacts of increased demand for police services.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	Future population growth and development will continue to increase the need for law enforcement services and facilities under all alternatives.			

### 1.9.4. Parks and Recreation

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1: (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Parks, open space, and trails LOS— countywide</b>	Based on the LOS standards adopted in 1999 and the current inventory, population growth under Alternative 1 would result in a deficit of 416.37 acres of regional parks, a deficit of 152.87 acres of local and community parks, a surplus of 3,397.6 acres of open space, and a surplus of 56.32 miles of trails.	Based on the LOS standards adopted in 1999 and the current inventory, population under Alternative 2 would result in a deficit of 464.9 acres of regional parks, a deficit of 162.58 acres of local parks, a surplus of 3,349.89 acres of open space, and a surplus of 55.79 miles of trails.	Based on the LOS standards adopted in 1999 and the current inventory, population under this alternative would result in a deficit of 574.19 acres of regional parks, a deficit of 184.44 acres of local parks, a surplus of 3,242.42 acres of open space, and a surplus of 54.61 miles of trails beyond the existing inventory.	<u>Based on the LOS standards adopted in 1999 and the current inventory, population under Alternative 2 would result in a deficit of 464.87 acres of regional parks, a deficit of 162.57 acres of local parks, a surplus of 3,349.91 acres of open space, and a surplus of 55.79 miles of trails.</u>
<b>Recreational facilities— countywide</b>	Demand for recreational facilities would increase, but to a lesser degree than under the other alternatives.	Greater demand than Alternative 1, more localized demand where denser development is proposed within UGA growth nodes.	Greatest demand; demand would be more widely spread due to greater expansion of UGAs.	<u>Similar demand to Alternative 2, more localized demand where denser development is proposed within UGA growth nodes.</u>
<b>Location of demand— countywide</b>	The ULID #6 and Central Kitsap UGAs, and, to a somewhat lesser degree the Kingston and Silverdale UGAs, would experience the most pronounced increases in demand for park, trails, and recreational facilities than other unincorporated UGAs, but to a lesser degree than under the other alternatives.	Demand would be most pronounced in the ULID #6 and Port Orchard UGAs, and to a somewhat lesser degree in the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs. Demand in these areas would be greater than under Alternative 1 and less than under Alternative 3. With increased demand on facilities there would be increased need for land acquisition as well as additional staffing and maintenance.	Demand would be most pronounced in the Silverdale, Port Orchard, Central Kitsap, and ULID#6 UGAs, and would also affect larger regional parks near these areas, such as Illahee Preserve Heritage Park, Banner Forest Heritage Park, and Coulter Creek Heritage Park. With increased demand for facilities there would be increased need for land acquisition as well as additional staffing and	<u>Demand would be most pronounced in the ULID #6 and Port Orchard UGAs, and to a somewhat lesser degree in the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs. Demand in the ULID #6 UGA would be the same as under Alternative 2; demand in the Port Orchard UGA would be somewhat greater than under Alternative 2; and demand in the Central Kitsap and Silverdale UGAs would be somewhat lower than under Alternative 2. With increased</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1: (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	Recreation facilities and outdoor amenities that are within relatively dense portions of the sub-area, such as the Clear Creek Trail, Old Mill Park (the waterfront), Anna Smith Children's Park, Silverdale Rotary Gateway Park (skate park), and Island Lake Park would experience increased use, but to a lower degree than under the other alternatives. The Clear Creek park and open space land would meet some of the increased need if developed.	There would be approximately twice the demand for parks and recreational facilities as under Alternative 1. Existing facilities would be more heavily used than under Alternative 1.	Greatest demand and greatest increases in use, with population approximately five times that expected under Alternative 1 and twice that under Alternative 2. However, localized impacts on facilities outside downtown Silverdale could be less than under Alternative 2 due to less concentrated population.	<u>demand on facilities there would be increased need for land acquisition as well as additional staffing and maintenance.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ LOS standards could be reassessed and lowered if funding constraints prohibit further acquisition or development of facilities.</li> <li>▪ The County could consider allowing public use of undeveloped or partially developed parkland in or near urban areas. For instance, sites could be used with unimproved parking areas one to two open play areas or fields for team practices and games, and portable restroom facilities.</li> <li>▪ Other funding sources discussed in the Park Plan include continuing to apply for state and federal grants, creating partnerships with other County departments, cities, nonprofit organizations, park districts, and school districts, and establishing a foundation or creating a countywide park district.</li> <li>▪ Impacts on park and recreation land and facilities would be mitigated to the degree that each alternative provides the parks and facilities projected by LOS requirements through additional projects identified in the Park Plan.</li> <li>▪ The level of impact fees could be recalculated to account for new LOS standards.</li> <li>▪ Development standards of zones implementing the proposed Mixed Use zone or other upzones under Alternatives 2 and 3 <u>or the Preferred Alternative</u> could require open space to be provided by the developer.</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1: (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ User fees could be initiated or increased at specific County parks and recreation facilities.</li> <li>▪ Regular review of UGA boundaries and buildable land capacity in conformance with GMA requirements could help reduce the potential for future parkland to become difficult to acquire due to scarcity.</li> <li>▪ The County could consider joint use of facilities for parks and recreation purposes such as school athletic fields and playgrounds.</li> </ul> <p>With the increase in population and urbanization of the county under any of the alternatives, there would be greater demand for parks, recreational facilities, and programs. However the impacts on facilities are not expected to be adverse, since the County establishes an LOS and parks capital facility plans to provide services and meet demand.</p> <p>Neighborhoods surrounding existing, new or expanded parks would experience more activity in the form of vehicles and pedestrians. Costs for acquiring parks will rise with the increased demand for urban land.</p>			

<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this analysis, the current inventory includes undeveloped land, funded acquisitions, and acquisitions anticipated to occur by 2012 and shown in the ~~draft~~-CFP (Appendix A of Volume I), as confirmed by the County's Director of Administrative Services and the County Administrator.

### 1.9.5. Schools

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Countywide	For the North Kitsap, Central Kitsap, South Kitsap, and Bremerton school districts, which serve the unincorporated area, a combined capacity deficit of facilities for 13,637 students would occur in 2025, based on total population growth (including in cities), student generation rates supplied by the North and South Kitsap districts, and the existing enrollment-to-population ratio in the Central Kitsap and Bremerton districts.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1, with the need for capacity for 15,323 additional students in the four districts combined.	Greatest impacts, with the need for capacity for 18,988 additional students in the four districts combined.	<u>Slightly greater impacts than Alternative 2, with the need for capacity for 15,559 additional students in the four districts combined.</u>
	If school enrollment growth is proportionate to population growth, the increase would be about 36% from cities, about 37% from unincorporated UGAs, and about 27% from rural areas. The greatest population growth would occur in the South Kitsap and Central Kitsap School Districts; however, the greatest school enrollment growth would occur in the North Kitsap and South Kitsap school districts.	If school enrollment growth is proportionate to population growth, the increase would be about 35% from cities, about 42% from unincorporated UGAs, and about 23% from rural areas. The greatest population growth would occur in the South Kitsap and Central Kitsap School Districts; however, the greatest school enrollment growth would occur in the North Kitsap and South Kitsap school districts.	If school enrollment growth is proportionate to population growth, the increase would be about 29% from cities, about 52% from unincorporated UGAs, and about 19% from rural areas. The greatest population growth would occur in the South Kitsap and Central Kitsap School Districts; however, the greatest school enrollment growth would occur in the North Kitsap and South Kitsap school districts.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>



Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	The majority of added enrollment would occur in the South Kitsap School District, primarily in the ULID #6 UGA, as well as in the southern portion of the North Kitsap School District, around the Kingston and Poulsbo UGAs.	Same as Alternative 1.	The majority of added enrollment would occur in the South Kitsap School District primarily in the Port Orchard and ULID #6 UGAs, followed by the Central Kitsap School District primarily in the Silverdale UGA, and the North Kitsap School District.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>
<b>North Kitsap School District</b>	A capacity deficit of facilities for 4,140 elementary students and 460 secondary students would occur in 2025, based on the district's student generation rates, total population growth in the district (accounting for unincorporated county as well as cities), and existing school capacity district-wide.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1, with the need for capacity for 4,088 elementary students and 429 secondary students beyond current capacity.	Greatest impacts, with the need for capacity for 4,438 elementary students and 639 secondary students beyond current capacity.	<u>Slightly lower impacts than Alternative 2, with the need for capacity for 4,066 elementary students and 416 secondary students beyond current capacity.</u>
<b>South Kitsap School District</b>	A capacity deficit of facilities for 2,992 elementary students and 3,528 secondary students would occur in 2025, based on the District's student generation rates, total population growth in the District (accounting for unincorporated county as well as cities), and existing district wide school capacity.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1, with the need for capacity for 3,509 elementary students and 4,045 secondary students beyond current capacity.	Greatest impacts, with the need for capacity for 4,186 elementary students and 4,722 secondary students beyond current capacity.	<u>Somewhat greater impacts than Alternative 2, with the need for capacity for 3,551 elementary students and 4,087 secondary students beyond current capacity.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Central Kitsap School District</b>	A capacity deficit of facilities for 1,141 elementary students and 2,167 secondary students would occur in 2025, based on the district's existing enrollment-to-population ratio, total population growth in the district (accounting for unincorporated county as well as cities), and existing district wide school capacity.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1, with the need for capacity for 1,467 elementary students and 2,500 secondary students beyond current capacity.	Greatest impacts, with the need for capacity for 2,267 elementary students and 3,319 secondary students beyond current capacity.	<u>Somewhat greater impacts than Alternative 2, with the need for capacity for 1,567 elementary students and 2,601 secondary students beyond current capacity.</u>
<b>Bremerton School District</b>	There would be a surplus capacity for 958 elementary students, and a capacity deficit of facilities for 168 secondary students would occur in 2025, based on the district's existing enrollment-to-population ratio, total population growth in the district (accounting for unincorporated county as well as cities), and existing district wide school capacity.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1, with the need for capacity for 210 secondary students beyond current capacity. There would be a surplus capacity for 925 elementary students.	Greater impacts than Alternative 1, with the need for capacity for 283 secondary students beyond current capacity. There would be a surplus capacity for 866 elementary students.	<u>Slightly lower impacts than Alternative 2, with the need for capacity for 204 secondary students beyond current capacity. There would be a surplus capacity for 930 elementary students.</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	Population growth in the sub-area would generate increases in enrollment at schools; however, based on the existing enrollment-to-population ratio and existing capacity at schools serving the sub-area, there would be sufficient capacity in existing facilities to accommodate projected growth.	Same as Alternative 1.	Same as Alternative 1.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The County and school districts could work together to identify potential sites for new school development in areas where higher amounts of growth are planned.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>The demand for school services and facilities will increase as new development occurs and the number of families with school-aged children increases. Land developed or set aside for school facilities would be generally unavailable for other uses. With mitigation, significant, unavoidable adverse impacts would not be anticipated.</p>			

### 1.9.6. Solid Waste

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Countywide	Overall demand for solid waste and recycling would increase but would be relatively lower.	Greater demand than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 3. Total demand would be approximately 3% greater than under Alternative 1.	Greatest demand. Total demand would be approximately 8% greater than under Alternative 1 and 6% greater than under Alternative 2.	<u>Similar demand to Alternative 2. Total demand would be approximately 3% greater than under Alternative 1.</u>
Silverdale sub-area	Demand for solid waste and recycling would increase but would be relatively lower.	Greater demand than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 3. Total demand would be approximately 102% greater than under Alternative 1	Greatest demand. Total demand would be approximately 356% greater than under Alternative 1 and 125% greater than under Alternative 2.	<u>Greater demand than Alternative 1 but less than Alternative 2. Total demand would be approximately 98% greater than under Alternative 1</u>
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Based on available landfill capacity at the County's current contracted landfill location, which is managed by WMI, a new or extended contract could be enacted to provide landfill capacity well beyond the 2025 planning horizon.</li> </ul>			
Significant unavoidable adverse impacts	<p>Future population growth and development would continue to increase the amount of solid waste generated in the county under any alternative. With Solid Waste Management Plans, regularly updated as appropriate, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.</p>			

### 1.9.7. Wastewater

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Countywide	Total wastewater flows for unincorporated UGAs and cities would increase by approximately 5.6 million gallons per day (mgd) by 2025. Flows to septic systems in rural areas would increase by about 2.1 mgd.	Greater increase, with total wastewater flows for the unincorporated UGAs and cities increasing by approximately 6.4 mgd by 2025. Flows to septic systems in rural areas would increase by about 2.1 mgd.	Greatest increase, with total wastewater flows for the unincorporated UGAs and cities increasing by approximately 8.3 mgd by 2025. Flows to septic systems in rural areas would increase by about 2.1 mgd.	<u>Similar increase to Alternative 2, with total wastewater flows for the unincorporated UGAs and cities increasing by approximately 6.4 mgd by 2025. Flows to septic systems in rural areas would increase by about 2.1 mgd.</u>
	Employment uses within the SKIA UGA could generate up to 1.94 mgd of additional wastewater. Projected employment growth within the Gorst UGA could generate up to 0.02 mgd of additional wastewater.	Estimated flows for employment uses in SKIA and Gorst similar to Alternative 1.	Employment uses within the SKIA UGA could generate up to 2.97 mgd of additional wastewater. Projected employment growth within the Gorst UGA could generate up to 0.11 mgd of additional wastewater.	<u>Estimated flows for employment uses in SKIA and Gorst similar to Alternative 1.</u>
	On the whole, no additional capacity beyond currently planned improvements would be needed to meet wastewater treatment demand based on projected population growth within the county.	Same as Alternative 1.	On the whole, Under Alternative 3 no additional capacity above currently planned improvements would be needed to meet the wastewater treatment demand of projected <i>population</i> growth. However, the combined population and employment demand may exceed current and planned treatment capacity.	<u>Same as Alternative 1.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<p>Locally improvements would be required in areas of growth. Estimated flows from SKIA will result in significant impacts on the Karcher Creek Sewer District's treatment capacity under existing and planned improvements. Karcher Creek has land area sufficient to house facilities to accommodate growth within SKIA and the existing service area. Local monitoring should occur to ensure that capacity improvements are implemented ahead of demand.</p>	<p>Same as Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Locally improvements would be required in areas of growth. The treatment capacities of the County's Central Kitsap Wastewater Facilities and the Port Orchard/Karcher Creek Sewer District treatment plant would be exceeded under Alternative 3. Both facilities contain sufficient land area to expand existing facilities to accommodate the increased flows. Local monitoring should occur to ensure that capacity improvements are implemented ahead of demand.</p>	<p><u>Same as Alternative 1.</u></p>	
<p>Lowest need for extension of wastewater conveyance systems.</p>	<p>Greater extension of wastewater conveyance systems needed than under Alternative 1.</p>	<p>Greatest extension of wastewater conveyance systems needed.</p>	<p><u>Greater extension of wastewater conveyance systems needed than under Alternative 1, but somewhat less extension needed than under Alternative 2.</u></p>	
<p>Some efficiencies gained from accommodating population in already developed areas.</p>	<p>Possibly most efficient provision of sewer service due to greater densification and accommodation of population in already developed areas. Lower minimum densities in areas designated Urban Low Residential and Urban Cluster Residential may be more costly to serve, but the range of allowed densities (4–9 du/ac) provides flexibility.</p>	<p>Some efficiencies gained from densification and from accommodating population in already developed areas, but these efficiencies may be offset by largest expansion of UGAs.</p>	<p><u>Similar efficiencies to Alternative 2. Efficiencies may be somewhat lower than Alternative 2 due to somewhat less densification and accommodation of population in Central Kitsap, but these lower efficiencies may be offset by somewhat less UGA expansion. However higher population density in Port Orchard in Mixed Use areas. Lower minimum densities in areas designated Urban Low Residential and Urban Cluster</u></p>	

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	No additional capacity above currently planned improvements would be needed to meet wastewater treatment demand based on projected population growth. Total wastewater flows for the Silverdale UGA would increase by approximately 0.4 mgd by 2025. Projected flows could be accommodated with existing treatment capacity.	Same as Alternative 1, with greater increase of total wastewater flows for the Silverdale UGA increasing by approximately 0.7 mgd by 2025 based on population estimates. Projected flows could be accommodated in programmed expansion of treatment capacity.	Same as Alternative 1, with greatest increase of total wastewater flows for the Silverdale UGA increasing by approximately 1.6 mgd by 2025 based on population estimates. Projected flows could be accommodated in programmed expansion of treatment capacity.	<u>Residential may be more costly to serve, but the range of allowed densities (4-9 du/ac) provides flexibility. Also Preferred Alternative adds regulations requiring urban wastewater service for residential developments.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The County could continue to coordinate with non-County facility providers, including cities and special purpose districts, to support and be consistent with the future land use patterns identified by city and County comprehensive plans.</li> <li>▪ Plan policies and development regulations could include mechanisms or incentives to encourage existing properties within UGAs to connect to sewer systems to meet planned growth levels. Methods or incentives could include formation of local improvement districts, permit facilitation and newcomer agreements for developer extensions, density bonuses to encourage lot consolidations, or allowing for innovative sanitary sewer extension and treatment facility designs, such as package plants, and membrane systems for urban densities and others.</li> <li>▪ Capital facility and land use plans could reduce the amount of effluent entering treatment systems by implementing water conservation programs when sewer service is extended to new areas.</li> <li>▪ The County could continue pursuing opportunities for water reclamation.</li> </ul> <p><u>Incorporated Plan Features-Preferred Alternative</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <u>The Preferred Alternative includes additional regulations supporting new policies that would require urban level sewer service in UGAs.</u></li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	With advance planning, implementation and update of capital facility plans no less than every 6 years, as well as review of development permits in terms of system impacts, no significant unavoidable adverse wastewater impacts would be anticipated within the range of alternatives reviewed.			



### 1.9.8. Stormwater

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
Countywide	Stormwater runoff would increase due to increased urbanization and impervious surface area.	Greater increase in impervious area than Alternative 1 due to more urbanization and some expansion of UGAs.	Greater increase in impervious area than Alternatives 1 and 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative</u> . Lower level of urbanization than Alternative 2, but offset by larger UGA expansion.	<u>Greater increase in impervious area than Alternative 1 due to more urbanization and some expansion of UGAs, but somewhat lower increase in impervious area than Alternative 2 due to somewhat less expansion of UGAs.</u>
	Need for additional stormwater system capacity would occur.	Greater need than Alternative 1.	Greatest need.	<u>Greater need than Alternative 1, but somewhat less need than Alternative 2.</u>
	In some cases, redevelopment would add private stormwater control facilities where none currently exist, and could result in localized reductions in the amount of stormwater runoff.	Would occur to a greater degree than under Alternative 1 due to greater redevelopment potential.	Moderate potential for redevelopment and associated benefits. Potential would be greatest in downtown Silverdale.	<u>Would occur to a greater degree than under Alternative 1 due to greater redevelopment potential, but a somewhat lesser degree than under Alternative 2 due to somewhat less redevelopment potential.</u>
Silverdale sub-area	Similar to countywide impacts.	Similar to countywide impacts.	Similar to countywide impacts.	<u>Similar to countywide impacts.</u>
Mitigation measures	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ <b>Update of the Kitsap County <i>Stormwater Management Ordinance and Design Manual</i>.</b> The Manual could be updated to include standards that are equivalent to the recently published Ecology standards (2005). These standards could require new developments to detain larger volumes of stormwater runoff and to release that stormwater in a pattern that better mimics natural conditions. Continuous simulation hydrologic models, which better simulate actual rainfall patterns in Kitsap County, might replace single storm event models in designing the size and configuration of detention ponds. The minimum length in which downstream impacts must be evaluated could be increased, and new developments could be required to incorporate all known and reasonable technologies (AKART) for stormwater management.</li> <li>▪ <b>Adoption of low impact development (LID) standards.</b> LID standards could be adopted to require new developments to incorporate LID</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
	<p>technologies wherever possible to aid in the reduction of stormwater impacts. Some examples of LID technologies are green roofs, bioretention swales or cells (rain gardens), pervious pavement, amended soils, forest cover retention, minimal excavation foundations, and general minimization of impervious surface coverage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b>Construction of regional detention facilities.</b> As previously described, current County standards require that new developments install onsite stormwater detention facilities if stormwater infiltration is not practical. Another potential mitigation measure would encourage or require that regional stormwater facilities be installed in place of or in addition to the onsite detention facilities that are currently required for new developments. Depending on the design criteria used, these regional ponds have the potential either to provide additional storage capacity that would help to reduce downstream flows or to provide an equivalent amount of detention as onsite facilities at a lower construction cost.         </li> </ul> <p>The application of slightly higher design standards to regional facilities that would provide more detention volume and lower discharge flows would likely have greater benefits than onsite facilities. Another benefit of regional detention facilities would be the greater probability that they would be maintained because maintenance responsibility would likely shift from property owners to the County or to local municipalities. In addition, the use of regional ponds may provide more opportunities for multi-use facilities, such as parks combined with stormwater facilities. On the other hand, challenges of regional detention facilities include up-front financing, timing of construction versus development, siting and constructing a conveyance system into the regional facility, and finding suitable locations large enough to detain significant amounts of stormwater. It is also more difficult to match existing hydrologic patterns when developing regional facilities; changes to existing patterns can affect baseline stream flows, lowering the quality of aquatic habitat.</p>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>With advanced planning, review of development applications, and implementation of mitigation measures, the level of unavoidable adverse impacts would be low for each of the three alternatives. The level of unavoidable adverse impacts depends on whether any of the potential mitigation measures are implemented. If one or more of the proposed mitigation measures is implemented, there would still be some changes to existing stormwater runoff patterns. This could alter flow conditions downstream of the planning areas and could potentially aggravate existing downstream flooding and erosion problems.</p>			

### 1.9.9. Water

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
Countywide	Based on the Consolidated Water System Plan (CWSP), adequate supply would exist countywide to meet water demand under Alternative 1 in 2025. Water supply capabilities should be continually monitored, especially in growing areas of the county (e.g., Kingston, Poulsbo, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, Port Orchard, and ULID#6 UGAs). However, a majority of water systems have deficiencies relating to Fire Code requirements.	Alternative 2 would have a greater water demand than Alternative 1 but would be under the CWSP population projections and within total water rights estimated in the CWSP. Water supply capabilities may require monitoring in areas forecast for significant growth (similar to Alternative 1).	Alternative 3 would have higher water demand than Alternatives 1 and 2. The forecast population for Alternative 3 would be above CWSP population assumptions but would not exceed water rights countywide. Water supply capabilities may require monitoring in areas forecast for significant growth (similar to Alternative 1).	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	Growth in the SKIA UGA could generate up to 1.35 mgd of additional water supply demand, and projected employment growth within the Gorst UGA could generate up to 0.022 mgd of additional water supply demand	New jobs could generate up to 1.51 mgd of additional water supply demand in the SKIA UGA and employees within the Gorst UGA could generate up to 0.074 mgd of additional water supply demand.	New jobs could generate up to 2.31 mgd of additional water supply demand in the SKIA UGA, and up to 0.098 mgd of additional water supply demand in the Gorst UGA.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	Relatively lower need for extension of water distribution systems.	Greater need for extension of water distribution systems than Alternative 1.	Greatest need for extension of water distribution systems.	<u>Greater need for extension of water distribution systems than Alternative 1, and somewhat lesser need than under Alternative 2.</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	Total maximum day demand would increase by approximately 0.5 mgd by 2025, for a total of 2.7 mgd. This demand would not exceed Silverdale Water District's water rights capacity of 4.2 mgd.	Higher demand, with an increase in the total maximum day demand of approximately 1.0 mgd by 2025, for a total of 3.3 mgd. Demand would not exceed water rights capacity.	Highest demand, with an increase in the total maximum day demand of approximately 2.1 mgd by 2025, for a total demand of 4.4 mgd. While countywide demand would not exceed capacity, additional water rights would be needed to meet demand within the Silverdale sub-area.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water systems should increase the size of piping, install additional looping to increase water pressure for fire flow, and/or increase frequency of hydrant placement to meet fire flow requirements.</li> <li>▪ Water providers and County planners should continue to consult early in plan updating processes to coordinate land use with future water supply needs, particularly in urban infill areas designated for higher densities.</li> <li>▪ Under Alternative 3, the Silverdale and North Perry Avenue Water Districts, should obtain additional water rights to meet projected demand in the Silverdale sub-area by 2025.</li> <li>▪ The County should review and revise landscaping codes as necessary to encourage use of drought tolerant plantings and reduce demand for water.</li> <li>▪ The County should encourage the use of rainwater retention systems in new and existing development to reduce water demand for landscaping needs.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>All alternatives would increase demand for water services, particularly Alternative 3. Although water supply plans appear to accommodate projected growth, localized growth pressures in areas with smaller systems could occur. However, with coordination of capital and land use planning, significant unavoidable adverse impacts are not anticipated.</p>			

### 1.9.10. Energy and Telecommunications

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Unincorporated county demand</b>	Demand for natural gas, electricity, and telecommunications would show the lowest increase. Service would be required for 19,642 additional housing units and 20,000 additional jobs.	Greater demand than Alternative 1, with service required for approximately 23,206 additional housing units and 38,000 additional jobs.	Greatest demand, with approximately 30,221 new housing units and 47,000 new jobs.	<u>Similar demand to Alternative 2, with service required for approximately 23,338 additional housing units and 36,000 additional jobs.</u>
	Extension of distribution lines for private utilities would be required in areas of new development for service to be available.	Somewhat more development of rural land to urban uses and associated need for services would occur. Service needs in the rural area would be similar to those under Alternative 1.	Greatest development of rural land to urban uses and associated need for services. Need in the rural area would be similar to that under Alternatives 1 and 2, except that the distribution of rural development is expected to be spread to additional Rural Wooded lands because the Rural Wooded Incentive Program could encourage growth in those locations in comparison to current policies and regulations.	<u>Somewhat less development of rural land to urban uses and associated need for services would occur than with Alternative 2. Service needs in the rural area would be similar to those under Alternative 1.</u>
	Some increases in efficiency of service provision would occur in UGAs based on densities and infill development.	Greatest increase in efficiencies of service provision would be achieved based on greatest densification in mixed use and higher-density nodes (e.g., Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and East and West Bremerton UGAs).	Increases in efficiencies greater in Port Orchard UGA due to more multifamily along corridors. However, this alternative would have less efficiencies than under Alternative 2 in the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and East and West Bremerton UGAs. Although urban growth is planned, greater efficiencies in these areas may be offset by the greater overall UGA	<u>Increases in efficiencies similar to Alternative 2 but somewhat lower in the Central Kitsap UGA due to less upzoning, and somewhat greater in the Port Orchard UGA due to more mixed use along corridors. However, this alternative would have somewhat less UGA expansion than Alternative 2, which could increase efficiencies</u>

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
			expansion, especially in Silverdale and Port Orchard UGAs.	<u>compared to that alternative.</u>
	Some increases in areas requiring cable coverage would occur.	More areas would require cable coverage based on Kitsap County's master ordinance than under Alternative 1.	Greatest amount of areas would require cable coverage.	<u>Somewhat fewer areas would require cable coverage than under Alternative 2.</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	PSE planned extension of the Silverdale transmission tape to the Puget Sound Energy (PSE) Valley Junction facility would be required.	The PSE planned improvement in Silverdale could be required sooner than under Alternative 1.	The PSE planned improvement in Silverdale could be required sooner than under Alternatives 1 and 2 <u>and the Preferred Alternative.</u>	<u>The PSE planned improvement in Silverdale could be required sooner than under Alternative 1.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Encourage site design that emphasizes tree retention and planting as well as optimizes solar access to moderate temperatures and reduces energy consumption. Encourage energy conservation through provider-sponsored programs and building codes.</li> <li>▪ Encourage co-location of telecommunications facilities and undergrounding of utilities (in urbanized areas) to minimize aesthetic and land use impacts of utility corridors and in rural area to minimize aesthetic and environmental impacts.</li> <li>▪ Encourage appropriate landscaping and stealth design of telecommunication facilities to minimize their visual impacts on their surroundings.</li> </ul>			
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	<p>Population and employment growth will increase demands for energy and telecommunications that in turn will increase the need for additional facilities. These demands are likely to occur with or without adoption of this 10-Year Update, although planning efforts to manage growth should reduce the demand and/or accommodate growth in a coordinated fashion than would otherwise occur.</p>			

### 1.9.11. Library

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	Preferred Alternative
<b>Countywide</b>	Per capita circulation of materials in the Kitsap Regional Library system would decrease below the current countywide level, but would still remain considerably higher than the statewide average.	A larger reduction in per capita circulation would occur, but it would still be considerably higher than the statewide average.	Largest reduction in service levels, but still considerably higher than the statewide average.	<u>Same as Alternative 2.</u>
	Based on areas of most pronounced population growth, the Kitsap Regional Libraries in Port Orchard, Kingston, and Silverdale would be most affected.	Based on areas of most pronounced population growth, the Kitsap Regional Libraries in Port Orchard, Kingston, Silverdale, and possibly Manchester would be most affected.	Based on areas of most pronounced population growth, the Kitsap Regional Libraries in Port Orchard, Kingston, Silverdale, and possibly Manchester would be most affected and at a greater level than under alternative 2.	<u>Based on areas of most pronounced population growth, the Kitsap Regional Libraries in Port Orchard, Kingston, and Silverdale, would be most affected. The library in Manchester would be less likely to be affected than with Alternative 2.</u>
<b>Silverdale sub-area</b>	The Kitsap Regional Library in Silverdale would experience the lowest levels of increased use and decreased service. There may be need to add facilities.	The Kitsap Regional Library in Silverdale would experience more increased use and decreased service levels than under Alternative 1, and there may be greater need to add facilities.	The Kitsap Regional Library in Silverdale would experience the most increased use and decreased service levels, and there may be the greatest need to add facilities.	<u>The Kitsap Regional Library in Silverdale would experience a similar level of increased use and decreased service to Alternative 2, and the need to add facilities would be similar to Alternative 2.</u>
<b>Mitigation measures</b>	<p>In addition to Incorporated Plan Features such as existing or proposed policies, and in addition to Applicable Regulations and Commitments such as adopted codes, the following Potential Mitigation Measures are proposed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Additional libraries and library capacity should be added in areas of concentrated and growing population, based on community input.</li> <li>▪ Funding sources could be diversified beyond property taxes, which currently provide 94.6% of funding, so that additional capacity may be added when it is needed.</li> <li>▪ The Library District could partner with municipalities by locating new libraries within incorporated areas where UGA expansions will contribute to the community's future growth.</li> </ul>			

Element of the Environment	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3	<u>Preferred Alternative</u>
<b>Significant unavoidable adverse impacts</b>	As population increases within the county, the demand for library services will also increase. The library system as a whole will be experience increased demand as more people require greater collections of materials and other resources; however, the library facilities located in areas of the county where the greatest new population growth is expected will experience the most increased demand. With advanced coordination between the Library District, the County, and municipalities, significant, unavoidable, adverse impacts are not anticipated.			