

Chapter 2. Alternatives

2.1. Introduction

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). There are several alternative approaches that the County may apply to meet its goal of completing its 10-Year Update consistent with the community vision and GMA requirements. This chapter of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) presents a description of the alternatives and provides background on the environmental review process, public involvement opportunities, and other information.

2.2. Purpose of Plan

The 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 the 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 the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP in 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.

2.3. Description of the Plan Area

Kitsap County is located in the Puget Sound region of western Washington. The county lies in the eastern portion of the Olympic Peninsula and includes the Kitsap Peninsula as well as Bainbridge Island. Kitsap County encompasses approximately 393 square miles of land and has an estimated population of approximately 240,400 (Washington State Office of Financial Management 2005). Please see Figure 2.1-1, *Base Map*.

The 10-Year Update, like the current Plan, addresses all unincorporated portions of Kitsap County, encompassing a total of approximately 336 square miles and a population of approximately 167,900 (Washington State Office of Financial Management 2005).

Land in the unincorporated county is generally designated as either Urban or Rural. Urban land, designated as UGAs in the Plan, is characterized by urban development where existing public facility and service capacity are available, or secondarily where public or private facilities or services are planned or could be provided in an efficient manner. Urban areas comprise cities totaling approximately 56.7 square miles (Bainbridge, Poulsbo, Bremerton, and Port Orchard) and unincorporated UGAs totaling an additional 38.4 square miles. Three cities, Poulsbo, Bremerton, and Port Orchard, are surrounded by future UGAs. All of these UGAs are listed below.

- Kingston
- Poulsbo
- Silverdale
- Central Kitsap
- East Bremerton
- West Bremerton
- Gorst
- Port Orchard

- ULID #6
- South Kitsap Industrial Area (SKIA)

Outside of the urban areas, rural lands include rural residential, rural industrial, and rural commercial areas; undeveloped areas; and lands for forestry, mining, and agriculture¹.

The incorporated cities of Bremerton, Port Orchard, Poulsbo, and Bainbridge Island are responsible for maintaining their own GMA comprehensive plans, which must be consistent with the County's Plan. The County's planning process, however, includes consultation and coordination with these jurisdictions.

Please see Figure 2.1-1 for a general map of the incorporated and unincorporated areas, including the current unincorporated UGA boundaries.

2.4. Environmental Review

2.4.1. Purpose of this DEIS

Level of Review

The purpose of this DEIS is to assist the public and agency decision makers in considering future decisions on comprehensive plan goals, policies, and development regulations as part of the 10-Year Update. These decisions will provide direction and support for more specific actions by the County, such as future implementing regulations and requests for future land use approvals on specific parcels of land.

This DEIS addresses two levels of analysis for the Proposed Action: a broad countywide analysis of potential impacts associated with proposed amendments to the Plan, and a more focused analysis of the Silverdale UGA. See Section 2.5.4, *Level of Analysis*, for more information.

Scope of Review

Pursuant to State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules (Washington Administrative Code [WAC] 197-11-408), the County requested public and agency comment on the scope of the DEIS. This was accomplished through publication of a Determination of Significance (DS)/Scoping Notice on March 18, 2006 (Appendix A DEIS). The scoping comment period ran for 21 days, ending on April 10, 2006.

¹ Agriculture primarily consists of hobby farms. The county does not contain commercially significant agricultural operations.

During this period, the County solicited public comment through the MyKitsap.org website, newspaper notices, postings on kiosks at public locations, and three public workshops. Please refer to Section 2.5.2, *Public Review Opportunities*, for additional description of these public involvement activities.

A total of 25 comment letters were received during the comment period. Many comments addressed policy issues or mitigation approaches, such as alternative ways to protect natural features and allow for growth. Topics are as follows, in the order of the number of comments received on each topic.

- Growth management (22)
- Natural resources (15)
- Streams and water quality (14)
- Transportation (8)
- Economic development (8)
- Site specific (7)
- Critical areas (5)
- Cultural resources (5)
- Open space (4)
- Land Use (3)
- Density (3)
- Stormwater runoff/flooding (3)
- Affordable housing (3)
- Water supply (3)
- Groundwater/aquifer recharge (2)
- Rural areas (2)
- Shorelines (2)
- Energy and utilities (2)
- Lighting (2)
- Public involvement (1)
- CPPs (1)

Comments were also provided at the three public workshops held during the scoping comment period. In general, these comments were focused on the vision statements for the Comprehensive Plan. Please refer to Section 2.5.2, *Public Review Opportunities*, for a summary of comments received at these public workshops.

This DEIS analyzes, at a programmatic level, the potential impacts on the following elements of the environment identified through the scoping process.

- Earth
- Air quality
- Water resources (surface and ground)
- Plants and animals
- Land and shoreline use
- Relationship to plans and policies
- Population, housing, and employment
- Cultural resources
- Aesthetics
- Transportation
- Noise
- Public buildings
- Law enforcement
- Fire protection
- Parks and recreation
- Water supply
- Wastewater/sewer
- Stormwater
- Solid waste
- Energy and telecommunications
- Libraries

2.5. GMA and SEPA Process

2.5.1. Integrated Plan and EIS

WAC 197-11-210 authorizes GMA counties and cities to integrate the requirements of the 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. At a minimum, environmental analysis at each stage of the GMA planning process should address impacts associated with planning decisions. Impacts associated with later planning stages can also be addressed. Analysis of environmental impacts in the GMA planning process can result in better-informed GMA planning decisions; avoid delays, duplication, and paperwork in future project-level environmental analysis; and narrow the scope of environmental review and mitigation under SEPA at the future project level.

GMA jurisdictions are authorized, but not required, to combine SEPA and GMA processes and/or to integrate documents. In either case, WAC 197-11-228 states that the appropriate scope and level of detail of environmental review should be tailored to the GMA action under consideration; jurisdictions may modify SEPA phased review as necessary to track the phasing of GMA actions; and the process of integrating SEPA and GMA should begin at the early stages of plan development.

Kitsap 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 GMA comprehensive plan amendments and facilitates coordination of public involvement activities. The information contained in this DEIS assists the County in refining a preferred alternative, related Comprehensive Plan amendments, and implementing regulations.

The combined DEIS/Plan document is structured as shown in Table 2.5-1. As shown, this DEIS is contained in Volume II of the integrated document.

Table 2.5-1. Kitsap County Integrated SEPA / GMA Plan and DEIS

Volume	Contents
Volume I: Policy Document	Summarizes the key issues identified in Volume II. Contains all policies and plans.
Volume II: Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)	Contains all Growth Management Act (GMA)- and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)-required inventories in the Affected Environment discussions. Analyzes No-Action and Proposed Action Alternatives. Summarizes Plan policies and adopted regulations that serve as mitigation measures.
Volume III: Proposed Regulations	Proposes development regulations and code amendments.
Appendices	Volume I appendices include the Capital Facilities Plan, a policy matrix related to the Silverdale Sub-Area Plan and other Rural Wooded policy materials. Volume II DEIS appendices include technical background information. Volume III appendices include maps and supporting materials.

In accordance with the requirements of SEPA and GMA, the County has provided for continuous public review and comment over the course of the planning process. Additional public review and comment opportunities are provided with the issuance of this DEIS. See Section 2.5.2, *Public Review Opportunities*, for a description of prior and upcoming public comment timelines and activities.

2.5.2. Public Review Opportunities

Public involvement, review, and comment are integral to the 10-Year Update process. Kitsap County has undertaken a proactive, comprehensive public involvement program to encourage participation in the development of Plan chapters and to ensure that the Plan ultimately meets community needs. The public involvement program is designed to meet the following objectives.

- To inform the community of update effort, including the reasons for the update, purpose of the Plan, state requirements, and Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) decisions.
- To obtain input from all members of the community through all aspects of Plan development.
- To engage the public and stakeholders in an open dialogue throughout the process.
- To encourage two-way communication between the County and community stakeholders.
- To identify interests, concerns, and issues as early as possible to avoid surprises later in the process.
- To ensure that elected officials, staff, and consultants are fully aware of and understand community and stakeholder concerns.
- To be aware of and communicate clearly about the integration of other plan processes in the 10-Year Update.

- To generate trust, confidence, and credibility in the project team, process, and resulting Plan.
- To develop a Plan that will have the support of the community and guide Kitsap County's growth over the next 20 years.

To achieve these objectives, the County's multi-faceted outreach program incorporates a wide range of activities. The following discussion summarizes public involvement activities that have already occurred and those that are planned for the future.

Prior Public Involvement Activities

- **MyKitsap.org webpage.** In January, a webpage was created and advertised as the on-line repository of all aspects of the 10-Year Update. Future meeting dates, published documents and analysis, contact people, and other key information were provided and frequently updated on this page.
- **Coordination with open space and recreation planning outreach efforts.** In January 2006, a 10-Year Update fact sheet and questionnaire were distributed at open space and recreation public meetings and focus groups.
- **Stakeholder meetings.** County staff met with numerous community groups between February and August 2006, explaining the 10-Year Update and upcoming workshop and comment opportunities. Community groups included special interest groups, private property owners, developers, fraternal organizations, neighborhood groups, and others.
- **Project fact sheet.** A project fact sheet that provides basic project background and contact information was widely distributed.
- **Project comment card.** A comment card inviting comments on project issues was broadly distributed at meetings and posted on the project website. Comments have been reviewed, with responses to commenters and/or incorporation of comments into the planning process.
- **Public display boards.** Three graphic display boards that describe the 10-Year Update progress and activities have been posted at high traffic areas, such as libraries, post offices, and other locations at the time of the public workshops.
- **Scoping and vision public meetings.** Three workshops were held in March 2006 to solicit public comment on the scope of the DEIS and the Plan vision statement. These meetings occurred on the following dates and locations.
 - March 23 in Kingston—70 participants.
 - March 27 in Silverdale—104 participants.
 - March 28 in Port Orchard—63 participants.

The key vision themes identified by participants throughout the county are listed below.

- Natural environment and open space protection and enhancement, balanced with growth.
- Consider broader natural environmental context and open space connections.
- Rural open space and buildings are part of Kitsap’s character.
- Define and distinguish urban and rural areas.
- Urban communities, livable and healthy, connected, safe, and innovative.
- Affordable and diverse housing choices.
- Economic prosperity, including balanced growth.
- Transportation plan that is balanced, measurable, and includes road and transit improvements.
- New transportation approaches.
- Improved ferries and transportation.
- Responsive and fair government.
- Link and balance all vision elements.

Please refer to *Vision Workshop Meeting Summary* (April 2006) for a more detailed description of these meetings.

- **Agency meetings.** During February, March, and June 2006, the County staff conducted a series of meetings with cities, special districts, and state agencies. The purpose of these meetings was to share information about the 10-Year Update, to hear from agency staff about issues and concerns, and to obtain relevant information for the 10-Year Update process. It is anticipated that these meetings will continue as needed throughout the duration of this project.
- **Alternatives public meetings.** Three workshops were held in May 2006 to solicit public comment on preliminary Plan alternatives. These meetings occurred as shown below.
 - May 15 in Kingston—28 participants.
 - May 18 in Silverdale—61 participants.
 - May 24 in Port Orchard—68 participants.

These meetings were intended to share information and obtain input about several potential alternatives to be studied in the DEIS and the future identification of a preferred alternative. Findings are summarized in *Alternatives Workshop Meeting Summary*, May 2006.

- **Focus groups.** From May to July 2006, focus group discussions with stakeholders were held on the following topics: water/sewer, transportation, housing and mixed use and code

development, Transfer of Development Rights and the Rural Wooded Incentive Program. The purpose of the focus groups was to review policy and implementation issues, understand diverging opinions, and identify policy options or solutions to address issues of common concern.

- **Kingston Phase II working group.** Between September 2004 through 2005, a citizen-based working group prepared recommendations on UGA sizing to accommodate 2025 population growth. They reviewed public service information, land use reclassification requests, UGA boundaries, Updated Land Capacity Analyses (ULCA), and reasonable measures.
- **Silverdale Sub-Area Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) meetings.** Beginning in November 2004, the Silverdale CAC has been holding public meetings to review various aspects of the sub-area, including potential watershed impacts of different development scenarios, existing information on public services and facilities, land capacity; and to provide input and comment on the Sub-Area Plan policies and alternative UGA boundaries. The CAC has also hosted two public open houses to share its findings related to existing conditions data and to seek input on alternative UGA boundaries. The CAC has held multiple public meetings and has taken public comment at each of these meetings.
- **Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) meetings.** A CAG was formed in August 2003 and concluded its recommendations in December 2005. The CAG also reviewed various aspects of the sub-area, including different development scenarios, existing information on public services and facilities, and land capacity; and provided input and comment on the Sub-Area Plan policies and alternative UGA boundaries. The CAG has also hosted two public open houses to share its findings related to existing conditions data and to seek input on alternative UGA boundaries. The CAG has held multiple public meetings and has taken public comment at each of these meetings. The City of Port Orchard Planning Commission held a public meeting on the Draft Sub-Area Plan in Winter 2006. The Port Orchard City Council held a public meeting and made a recommendation on the Draft Sub-Area Plan in April 2006. The Kitsap County Planning Commission held a hearing on the Draft Sub-Area Plan in Winter 2006.

Upcoming Public Involvement Opportunities

- **Draft Plan meetings.** The next set of open houses/public meetings in August/September 2006 will focus on the draft plan and DEIS and introduce concepts and information prior to the public hearings. The purpose of the meetings will be to share the draft plan and provide an opportunity to hear feedback from the public. Please refer to MyKitsap.org for additional information on these meetings.
- **Public hearings.** As part of the adoption process for the updated Plan, the Kitsap County Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) will conduct public hearings in September 2006. Please see the Fact Sheet of this document and refer to MyKitsap.org for additional information on these hearings.

2.5.3. Prior Environmental Review

Environmental review conducted for adoption of the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan included the *Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Draft and Final EIS (1994)* and two addenda issued in March and April 1998. Kitsap County has issued the following SEPA documents since adoption of the Plan in 1998; these documents are relevant to the analysis contained in this DEIS and in particular Alternative 1 (No-Action), which assumes continuation of the current Plan.

- *Draft South Kitsap UGA/ULID #6 Sub-Area Plan and Draft Supplemental EIS (An Integrated SEPA/GMA Document), October 26, 2001.*
- *Draft and Final Kingston Sub-Area Plan and Supplemental EIS, October 2002 and August 2003, respectively.*
- *Integrated Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan Draft EIS (2005) and Preliminary Final EIS (2006).*

This DEIS incorporates by reference the *Integrated Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan Draft and Preliminary Final EIS (May 2006)*, which contains environmental analysis of the proposed Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan. Similarly, the *Draft and Final Kingston Sub-Area Plan and Supplemental EIS October 2002/August 2003*, are incorporated by reference. All components of these documents are incorporated, with the exception of the land use, socioeconomic, and transportation information, as well as cumulative countywide information, which is updated in this DEIS.

2.5.4. Level of Analysis

SEPA (Revised Code of Washington [RCW]) 43.21C) requires government officials to consider the environmental consequences of actions they are about to take and to consider better or less damaging ways to accomplish those proposed actions. They must consider whether the proposed action will have a probable significant adverse environmental impact on the following elements of the natural and built environment: earth, air, water, plants and animals, energy and natural resources, environmental health, land and shoreline use, transportation, and public services and utilities.

This DEIS provides qualitative and quantitative analysis of environmental impacts as appropriate to the general nature of the 10-Year Update. The adoption of comprehensive plans or other long-range planning activities is classified by SEPA as a nonproject (i.e., programmatic) action. A nonproject action is defined as an action that is broader than a single site-specific project, and involves decisions on policies, plans, or programs. An EIS for a nonproject proposal does not require site-specific analyses; instead, the EIS discusses impacts and alternatives appropriate to the scope of the nonproject proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal. (WAC 197-11-442).

This DEIS considers potential environmental impacts at both the countywide and smaller area levels of detail.

- **Countywide analysis.** In general, environmental analysis has been conducted at a countywide and cumulative level. This broad cumulative review applies to the land use reclassification requests that have been accepted as part of the 10-Year Update process. In certain cases, where possible and where additional information may assist decision-making, smaller area analyses have been provided, as described below.
- **Smaller area analyses.** For some elements of the environment, information has been broken down into smaller areas of analysis. For example, watershed basins are referenced when possible in the discussion of surface water. These smaller units of analysis are intended to assist in decision making on the Plan as well as to increase the future utility of this DEIS.
- **Silverdale Sub-Area Plan.** Because the Silverdale Sub-Area Plan has been incorporated with the 10-Year Update, this DEIS provides an area-specific discussion of the Silverdale sub-area under each element of the environment. Where appropriate, the DEIS also identifies area-specific mitigation measures to address identified impacts. The DEIS also establishes recommended threshold levels, references existing regulations, and prescribes mitigation measures for impacts to allow future development that falls within these thresholds or complies with prescribed regulations/mitigation to proceed with minimal future SEPA review. Please refer to Section 2.6.3, *Description of Alternatives*, for additional discussion of the Silverdale sub-area and future SEPA exemptions.

2.5.5. Phased Review

SEPA encourages the use of phased environmental review to focus on issues that are ready for decision and to exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ready for decision making (WAC 197-11-060(5)). Phased review is appropriate where the sequence of a proposal is from a programmatic document, such as an EIS addressing a comprehensive plan, to other documents that are narrower in scope, such as those prepared for site-specific, project-level analysis. Kitsap County is using phased review in its environmental review of its 10-Year Update with a programmatic review of its Plan amendments and associated implementing regulations.

2.5.6. Future Use of Document

The analysis in this DEIS will be used to review the environmental impacts of the Plan alternatives. Additional environmental review will occur as other project or nonproject actions are proposed to Kitsap County in the future. This approach will result in an additional incremental level of review when subsequent implementing actions require a more detailed evaluation and as additional information becomes available. In this case, subsequent phases of environmental review may consider proposals that implement the Plan, such as land use

regulations, specific development proposals, or other similar actions. Future environmental review could occur in the form of Supplemental EISs (SEIS), SEPA addenda, or DNSs.

An agency may use previously prepared environmental documents to evaluate proposed actions, alternatives, or environmental impacts. The proposals may be the same as or different than those analyzed in the existing documents (WAC 197-11-600[2]).

Existing documents may be used for a proposal through one or more of the methods listed below (WAC 197-11-600).

- **Adoption.** An agency may use all or part of an existing environmental document to meet its responsibilities under SEPA. Agencies acting on the same proposal for which an environmental document was prepared are not required to adopt the document.
- **Incorporation by reference.** An agency preparing an environmental document includes all or part of an existing document by reference. Incorporation by reference is a technique that may be used with any SEPA document for a proposal. Unlike the adoption process, which is limited to environmental documents issued under either SEPA or the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), any information may be incorporated by reference. Such information may include any study or report that provides information relevant to a proposal. (Washington State Department of Ecology 1998)
- **Addendum.** Adds analyses or information about a proposal but does not substantially change the analysis of significant impacts and alternatives in the existing environmental document. A notice of adoption of a prior SEPA environmental document (e.g., Final EIS (FEIS), DNS, or Mitigated DNS [MDNS]) accompanies the addendum.
- **Preparation of SEIS.** Preparation of an SEIS is appropriate under either of the conditions listed below.
 - There are substantial changes so that the proposal is likely to have significant adverse environmental impacts.
 - There is new information indicating a proposal's probable significant adverse environmental impacts.
 - If a proposal is substantially similar to one covered in an existing EIS, that EIS may be adopted; additional information may be provided in an addendum or SEIS.

The decision criteria, upon which the County may rely to determine the most appropriate document, are shown below.

Question. Is the proposal similar to or within the range of alternatives studied for the subject area or site?

- If yes, then,
 - Adoption of the prior environmental document with or without an addendum that explains minor new information or analyses may be appropriate, or
 - Preparation of an SEIS may be appropriate if there are potential significant impacts of the current project or nonproject action that were not addressed in the prior environmental documents, or if different conclusions are reached on an impact than determined in the prior document as a result of new information.
- If no, then,
 - Analysis of the current proposal may require an SEIS to examine new alternatives, or
 - A DNS/MDNS may be appropriate if impacts are likely to be insignificant or able to be mitigated to an insignificant level.

The above discussion is illustrated in Figure 2.5-1.

2.5.7. Silverdale Sub-Area Mixed Use and Residential SEPA Exemption

SEPA allows a categorical exemption for new residential or mixed use development if the development is within a UGA and current density/intensity of use is lower than called for in the goals and polices of the comprehensive plan, provided the plan was previously subjected to environmental analysis through an EIS. This DEIS will provide sufficient environmental analysis of the Silverdale sub-area to meet the criteria for application of the categorical exemption for infill residential and mixed use development pursuant to RCW 43.21C.229.

Please refer to Section 2.6.3, *Description of Alternatives*, for a description of the applicable area in the Silverdale sub-area and the assumptions under each alternative.

2.6. Development of Alternatives

2.6.1. Planning Process and Development of Alternatives

This DEIS addresses three alternatives: Alternative 1 (No Action), Alternative 2, and Alternative 3. Alternative 1 is required by SEPA and is the continuation of the current Plan. Alternatives 2 and 3 review different locations and amounts of UGA intensification and expansion. Implementing policies and regulations are addressed for some aspects of Alternatives 2 and 3. The purpose of the alternatives is to provide decision makers and the public with growth options before a plan is adopted, and to test the environmental implications of each.

Alternatives 2 and 3 have been developed on the basis of the public involvement process, sub-area plans, Washington State population projections, GMA requirements, CPSGMHB decisions, and Kitsap County CPPs.

- **Public involvement process.** The County solicited public input at two series of workshops to help develop the Draft Plan, one series addressing the vision statement and the second series addressing different land use plans for the unincorporated UGAs. See Section 2.5.2, *Public Review Opportunities*, for more information. The public input has helped shape the alternatives reviewed in this DEIS.
- **Washington State population projections.** According to GMA and the adopted CPPs, the Plan must be reviewed every 10 years to accommodate 20 years of population growth. The CPPs establish a population target of 331,571 by 2025. This is roughly a 100,000-person increase over the next 20 years. The CPPs hold that about 76% of the population growth should occur in UGAs and cities and 24% in rural areas. The alternatives show different means to achieve the population projections in the UGAs. This is described in more detail below.
- **Sub-area plans.** The County adopted the Plan in 1998 Comprehensive Plan and then adopted (or is in the process of completing) nine sub-area plans. The County intends to include adopted and in-process sub-area plans as chapters of the updated Plan. Sub-area plans that are in process for rural areas are not directly related to the 10-Year Update and could be considered in 2007 as part of the County's annual amendment process. For in-process sub-area plans, such as Silverdale and South Kitsap/Port Orchard, the alternatives test different land use patterns under consideration by CACs. For the Kingston Sub-Area Plan, which was recently remanded by the CPSGMHB, all alternatives review the proposed Kingston Sub-Area Plan as of December 2005, but do vary with regard to density ranges and building heights. See below for more information.
- **GMA requirements.** GMA requires counties to review their designated UGAs and the densities permitted within them at least every 10 years and revise them to accommodate the urban growth projected to occur in the county in the succeeding 20-year period. GMA also requires that plans be consistent with the 13 GMA goals related to urban growth, reduction of sprawl, transportation, housing, economic development, property rights, permits, natural resource industries, open space and recreation, environment, citizen participation and coordination, public facilities and services, and historic preservation. GMA compliance for each alternative is addressed in Section 3.2.2, *Relationship to Plans and Policies*.
- **CPSGMHB cases.** Over the last several years, a number of CPSGMHB decisions have affected and prioritized the planning efforts in the County. Two of the most recent cases are summarized below.
 - In case number 04-3-0031c, the CPSGMHB concluded that Kitsap County was out of compliance with GMA by not having completed its 10-Year Update. The County argued that the update should be completed in 2008, rather than 2006, because the Plan only became valid in 1998. However, the CPSGMHB ordered the County to take appropriate

- legislative action to comply with the review and revision requirements of RCW 36.70A.130 (3) for its UGA designations and permitted urban densities by June 30, 2006. The CPSGMHB later granted an extension to the current deadline of December 31, 2006.
- In August 2004, the CPSGMHB ruled on the Interim Rural Forest/Rural Wooded policies enacted in the 2003 Plan process (case number 04-3-0009c), indicating the policies were out of compliance with GMA. The County believes that the Rural Wooded Incentive Program is appropriate for Kitsap County, but acknowledges the CPSGMHB’s findings that program parameters need to be clearly defined. The BOCC repealed portions of the Rural Wooded Incentive Program to comply with the CPSGMHB’s order. The County has expressed its commitment to continuing to work on this program in conjunction with the 10-Year Update using information compiled over the past decade to develop a Rural Wooded Incentive Program that fully complies with the CPSGMHB’s decision. Proposed Rural Wooded policies and implementing regulations are studied in this DEIS. In the same case, the CPSGMHB also required the County to adopt and implement reasonable measures to provide for efficient land use inside UGAs meeting County density goals.
 - As of July 26, 2006, the CPSGMHB issued a decision on the consistency of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan and ULCA with the GMA in case number 06-3-0007. The CPSGMHB found that adoption of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan, expanding an individual UGA prior to the 10-year review of the county’s UGAs, countywide analysis, and collective consideration to accommodate the full 2025 population target did not comply with GMA. The CPSGMHB also found that expansion of the Kingston UGA in advance of adoption of “reasonable measures” did not comply with GMA. In addition, the CPSGMHB indicated that a ULCA that discounted un-sewered areas of the existing UGA and a CFP that did not sufficiently provide services did not comply with GMA. The CPSGMHB did find in favor of Kitsap County for other discount factors in the ULCA because they were tailored to local circumstances and were balanced by a relatively low market factor. The CPSGMHB remanded the Sub-Area Plan to the County for review and to take appropriate legislative action in concert with the 10-Year Update. A discussion of how the DEIS analysis relates to this decision is found at the end of Section 2.6.1, *Planning Process and Development of Alternatives*.
 - **CPPs.** CPPs are the framework for city and county plans in Kitsap County. Topics addressed include: countywide growth patterns, UGAs, centers of growth, rural land uses and development patterns, countywide strategies for open space preservation, resource protection and critical areas, contiguous and orderly development, siting public capital facilities of a countywide or statewide nature, transportation, affordable housing, countywide economic development, an analysis of the fiscal impact, coordination with Tribal governments, coordination with the federal government (including the Navy), and roles and responsibilities. Compliance for each alternative is addressed in Section 3.2.2, *Relationship to Plans and Policies*.

Population Growth Targets and Employment Projections

According to GMA and the adopted CPPs, the Plan must be reviewed every 10 years to accommodate 20 years of population growth. The CPPs establish a population target of 331,571 by 2025.

Future growth is based on population distributions recommended by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council, which is composed of elected officials and planning directors from all city and Tribal jurisdictions in addition to the BOCC and Kitsap County's planning director. The population distributions were adopted by the BOCC and ratified by the cities. The County adopted the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) intermediate range population forecast for Kitsap County through the CPPs.

A breakdown of the expected population growth and associated annual growth rates for Kitsap County, its cities, and UGAs is shown in Table 2.6-1. Most new population (approximately 76%) is expected to occur within the existing UGA boundaries. This projected growth reflects a greater percentage of the population residing in urban areas than was the case in 2000, when 58% of the population resided in urban areas (Kitsap County CPPs 2004).

Table 2.6-1. Kitsap County Population Projections: 2000–2025

Population Distribution through 2025		2000 Population	Through 2025		
			+ New Population	= Total in 2025	Annual Growth Rate
Bremerton	City ¹	37,258	14,759	52,017	1.34%
	East Urban Growth Area (UGA) ²	5,412	2,210	7,622	1.38%
	West UGA ²	3,229	2,017	5,246	1.96%
Bremerton Port UGA ¹		68	-68	0	-100%
Central Kitsap UGA ²		21,743	8,733	30,476	1.36%
Gorst UGA ²		154	73	227	1.56%
Silverdale UGA ²		15,276	8,059	23,335	1.71%
Bainbridge Island City ¹		20,308	8,352	28,660	1.39%
Kingston UGA ³		1,871	3,135	5,006	4.02%
Poulsbo	City ¹	6,813	3,739	10,552	1.77%
	UGA ¹	901	3,355	4,256	6.41%
Port Orchard	City ¹	7,693	3,600	11,293	1.55%
	UGA ¹	11,570	3,375	14,945	1.03%
Port Orchard UGA expansion study area ³		0	6,334	6,334	
South Kitsap UGA ¹		1,241	8,024	9,265	8.37%

Population Distribution through 2025	2000 Population	Through 2025		
		+ New Population	= Total in 2025	Annual Growth Rate
UGA population	133,537 (58%)	75,697 (76%)	209,234 (63%)	1.81%
Non-UGA population	98,432 (42%)	23,905 (24%)	122,337 (37%)	0.87%
Total county population	231,969	99,602	331,571	1.44%

Source: Kitsap County CPPs.

¹Based on city and/or County comprehensive or sub-area planning.

²Based on Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) Model.

³Target to be substantiated by further analysis and/or sub-area planning.

The 2025 total population target for unincorporated Kitsap County is 229,049 persons. Adjusted from a 2000 base year in the CPPs to 2005, this represents a growth target of approximately 59,628 additional people between 2005 and 2025. The 2005–2025 growth target for unincorporated urban areas is approximately 39,207 in new population, and the growth target for rural areas is approximately 20,421.

While the County projects future employment, there is no specific employment target for Kitsap County or its jurisdictions. Based on observed employment trends, a countywide jobs forecast was developed by reviewing employment growth in seven job sectors, and trending forward average annual growth rates (AAGR) within each sector to 2025. Manufacturing jobs were then adjusted upward to equal 9% of total jobs forecast for 2025, allowing the new total to float upward, reflecting the County's policy commitment to increase its manufacturing jobs base similar to the 1998 Comprehensive Plan projections. The resulting countywide forecast is shown in Table 2.6-2.

Table 2.6-2. Countywide Employment Forecast

Sector	1995	2004	AAGR	2025 Trended	2004 Distribution	2025 Distribution
Industrial Sector Jobs						
Construction Resources	3,331	4,263	2.8%	7,600	5%	6%
Manufacturing	1,303	1,589	2.2%	10,700*	2%	9%
Warehousing/Transportation/ Utilities	1,523	1,877	2.3%	3,100	2%	2%
Total Industrial Jobs	6,157	7,729	2.6%	21,400	10%	17%
Commercial Sector Jobs						
Retail	8,336	9,969	2.0%	15,100	13%	12%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate)	2,504	3,269	3.0%	6,100	4%	5%
Services	21,725	28,541	3.1%	53,900	37%	24%
Total Commercial Jobs	60,245	70,386	1.7%	106,000	90%	83%
Total	66,402	78,115	1.8%	127,400	100%	100%

Sources: PSRC; E.D. Hovee & Company, LLC.

Note: For the manufacturing sector, the 2025 number was first trended and then adjusted to equal 9% of the employment total (allowing the new jobs total to float upwards).

Reviews of city plans indicate that they would accommodate about one-third of the net increase in employment; unincorporated Kitsap County would then accommodate the remaining roughly two-thirds of the net increase in employment.

Sub-Area and Community Planning Process

With adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, the County began developing a series of sub-area plans to address the unique needs and features of specific geographical areas. Once adopted, the sub-area plans became components of the Comprehensive Plan. Since 1998, the County has adopted six sub-area plans, four of which apply to UGAs.

- Kingston Sub-Area Plan—Adopted in 2005; remanded in July 2006.
- Manchester Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) Sub-Area Plan—2002.
- Port Orchard/South Kitsap UGA/Sub-Area Planning Process—in progress.
- Poulsbo Sub-Area Plan—2001.
- Silverdale Sub-Area Planning Process—in progress.
- SKIA Sub-Area Plan—2003.

- Suquamish LAMIRD Rural Village Sub-Area Plan —2005.
- ULID #6 Sub-Area Plan—2003.

The County intends to include adopted and in-process (Kingston, Port Orchard and Silverdale) sub-area plans as chapters of the 10-Year Update. In addition, the County is considering portions of the Illahee Community Plan, a citizen-sponsored document.

Kingston Sub-Area Plan CPSGMHB Decision and DEIS Analysis

As described previously, the CPSGMHB remanded the Kingston Sub-Area Plan that was adopted by the County in December 2005. While the CPSGMHB decision was pending, alternatives were developed for study by the BOCC to maintain a schedule to complete the 10-Year Update mandate. The BOCC provided guidance to County staff and consultants on the menu and range of Alternatives 1 and 3 on May 31, and Alternative 2 on July 12.

All 10-Year Update alternatives assume the UGA boundary as determined by Kitsap County in December 2005. At the time the 10-Year Update alternatives were prepared, the December 2005 Kingston boundaries represented those approved by the BOCC. With the CPSGMHB decision newly issued as of July 26, 2006, the Kingston Sub-Area Plan boundaries are remanded and are now considered “proposed” under all alternatives. However, DEIS alternatives do vary density ranges and heights, as well as the inclusion of reasonable measures.

As the CPSGMHB review was pending, the alternatives developed for study varied the inclusion of the sewer discount factor² to test different growth capacities. The DEIS generally studies the higher growth capacity numbers for each alternative, (i.e., the growth numbers that exclude the sewer discount factor). However, to meet the 10-Year Update mandate, analysis of alternatives has proceeded with the best available information at the time. Therefore, with the assumptions and capacity analyses available at the time, the transportation analysis considers the following assumptions: Alternative 1 with sewer discount factor; Alternative 2 with sewer discount factor; and Alternative 3 without sewer discount factor.

Appendix B summarizes the relationship of each DEIS topic to the alternatives’ growth levels with and without the sewer discount factor. To guide the planning process, Section 3.2.3, *Population, Housing, and Employment*, compares and contrasts each alternative with and without the sewer discount factor employed.

² This sewer discount factor was only applied to the existing UGA boundaries as of December 2005, and not to UGA expansion areas.

2.6.2. Proposal Objectives

As part of describing proposed actions and alternatives, SEPA requires the description of proposal objectives and features. Agencies are encouraged to describe a proposal in terms of objectives, particularly for agency actions to allow for consideration of a wider range of alternatives and measurement of the alternatives alongside the 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, West and East Bremerton, Gorst, ULID #6, and 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 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.

2.6.3. Description of Alternatives

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 will be 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 will be 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 proposed.
 - Land use redesignations are proposed by the County to guide future land uses and densities so that they accommodate population growth targets and employment forecasts. Proposed redesignations include refinement of areas designated for housing, employment, and protection of natural areas.
 - Alternative 3 proposes changes to the designated boundaries in eight of the 10 UGAs within unincorporated Kitsap County; Alternatives 2 proposes seven changes. Proposed changes will refine the existing UGA boundaries to accommodate population growth targets and forecast need for additional employment.
 - Consolidations of Land Use Map designations are proposed as part of Alternative 2. 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 would be retained and updated.
 - Alternative 3 entails approximately 120 land use reclassification requests initiated by property owners; Alternative 2 entails 83 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 primarily proposed under Alternative 2. Proposed policy changes are identified below.
- **Implementing regulations.** Development regulations, such as zoning, implement the Plan. A series of implementing regulations have been prepared in association with Alternative 2 and some with Alternative 3.

Alternatives Overview

Figures 2.6-1 to 2.6-10 identify land use alternatives studied in this DEIS identifying the land use pattern as a whole as well as proposed area of change. Table 2.6-3 presents descriptions of the alternatives evaluated in this DEIS and how they address the major components described above.

Table 2.6-3. Alternatives Comparison

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

	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes one UGA boundary contraction between Silverdale and Central Kitsap. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposes more extensive UGA boundary expansions than Alternative 2.
Comprehensive Plan Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Goals and policies remain the same as adopted in December 2005. 	<p>Policies are comprehensively updated in all elements. Concepts updated include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. Allowing increased density ranges for Urban High Residential and commercial zones, up to 30 du/ac instead of 24 du/ac. Policy and map revisions consolidating Comprehensive Plan land use map categories. 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). Update of housing and economic development policies to reflect greater diversity of choices Update of transportation and capital facility policies Update of utilities and natural system policies. Update of land use, as well as rural and resource lands policies. Inclusion of population allocation "banking" with respect to the Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, and West Bremerton UGAs. Inclusion of UGA Association and UGA Management Agreement (UGAMA) policies. Revision of the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Program policies. Inclusion of policies to encourage sewer connections for all new development and or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural Wooded and TDR Policies would be amended for this alternative.

Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
	<p>implementation of new innovative wastewater technologies (i.e. wastewater membrane systems)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Revisions to low impact development (LID) policies ▪ Additions of reasonable measure policies ▪ SKIA sub-area policy amendment for Industrial Multi-Purpose Recreational Area (IMPRA), and Urban Holding Area. 	
<p>Implementing Regulations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regulations remain as adopted as of December 2005. 	<p>Includes zoning and development permit facilitation amendments. Regulation amendments include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Areawide redesignations and rezones to implement Land Use Map and policy changes. ▪ Density and dimension amendments to match policy/map changes in Chapter 2, <i>Land Use</i>. ▪ New Mixed Use zone, Parks zone, and Urban Holding Area. ▪ Consolidation of some commercial categories. ▪ A consolidated Use Table in Title 17. ▪ Minimum densities in urban areas. ▪ Revisions to maximum height restrictions in some multifamily, commercial, mixed use, and industrial zones. ▪ Categorical exemptions from further environmental review for minor new construction countywide, and for mixed use and infill development within the Silverdale UGA. ▪ 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.). ▪ New TDR regulations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Includes Rural Wooded and associated TDR regulations.

The primary differences between the three alternatives pertain to the amount of new growth that would be accommodated and how that growth would be managed. Table 2.6-4 provides an overview of these differences.

Table 2.6-4. Overview of Alternatives: Unincorporated Kitsap County

	CPP Growth Target (2005–2025)	Alternative 1 (No Action)	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Total Population of Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas²	59,628 ¹	48,782—would not meet overall target (18% under target).	56,869—5% under target.	75,035—26% over target.
Housing Unit Growth Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas²	No CPP target; however, it is related to population.	Within UGAs 11,474 units—no change in capacity. In UGAs, growth primarily in single-family unit types (87% of total additional dwellings) and secondarily in multifamily (13%). Based on rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands.	Within UGAs 15,038 units—31% over existing capacity. In UGAs, growth primarily in single-family unit types (78%); greater percentage of multifamily than other alternatives (22%). Based on rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands.	Within UGAs 22,053 units—92% over existing capacity. In UGAs, growth in single-family unit types greatest of the three alternatives (87% of total additional dwellings) and secondarily in multifamily (13%). 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.
Employment Growth Capacity Unincorporated UGAs and Rural Areas²	No CPP target. County forecasts 32,664 net increase in jobs.	Approximately 20,000 jobs, no change in capacity. Buildable acres in industrial: 82% of total buildable employment acres. Buildable acres in commercial: 18%.	Approximately 38,000 jobs, 90% over existing capacity. Buildable acres in industrial: 68%. Buildable acres in commercial: 32%.	Approximately 47,000 jobs, 135% over existing capacity. Buildable acres in industrial: 75%. Buildable acres in commercial: 25%.
Unincorporated UGA	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.
Densification	Not applicable	No changes in allowed densities.	Densification allowed in six UGAs.	Limited densification allowed in six UGAs.

¹CPP 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.

²Capacity estimates are based on the County's Updated Land Capacity Analysis. See Appendix C.

Table 2.6-5 shows the CPP population allocation for each UGA, and the population and housing unit capacity of each UGA under all three alternatives.

Table 2.6-5. 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) ¹	Alternative 1: Without Sewer Reduction Factor ⁸		
			New Housing Units ²	New Population ³	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston ⁴	3,135	2,816	1,330	3,304	488
Poulsbo ⁵	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 ⁶	9,709	8,212	1,031	2,558	(5,654)
ULID #6 ⁴	8,024	7,553	3,646	9,075	1,522
SKIA	0	0	0	0	0
Rural area (non-UGA) ⁷	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
Total	69,220	59,628	19,642	48,782	(10,846)

b. Alternative 2 Population and Housing

UGA	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2000–2025)	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2005–2025) ¹	Alternative 2: Without Sewer Reduction Factor ⁸		
			New Housing Units ²	New Population ³	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston	3,135	2,816	1,117	2,774	(42)
Poulsbo ⁵	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 ⁶	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) ⁷	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
Total	69,220	59,628	23,206	56,869	(2,759)

c. Alternative 3 Population and Housing

UGA	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2000–2025)	CPP Net Population Growth Allocation (2005–2025) ¹	Alternative 3: Without Sewer Reduction Factor ⁸		
			New Housing Units ²	New Population ³	Difference with CPP Target
Kingston	3,135	2,816	1,328	3,301	485
Poulsbo ⁵	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 ⁶	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) ⁷	23,905	20,421	8,168	20,421	0
Total	69,220	59,628	30,221	75,035	15,407

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 Section 2.6.1 for a discussion of the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) decision regarding the sewer reduction factor. See 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 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 without the sewer reduction factor. See Appendix B.

Table 2.6-6 summarizes increases in density (upzones), changes in UGA boundaries, and land use reclassification requests for each UGA allowing a comparison among alternatives.

Table 2.6-6. Summary of Upzones, UGA Boundaries, and Land Use Reclassification Requests under the Alternatives

UGA	Upzones Proposed (i.e., greater density in existing UGA)			UGA Expansion			Land Use Reclass Requests	
	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 1	Alt 2	Alt 3	Alt 2	Alt 3
Kingston ¹							3	3
Poulsbo					✓	✓	2	3
Silverdale ²		✓	✓		✓	✓	33	33
Central Kitsap		✓	✓		✓	✓	2	3
East Bremerton		✓	✓				0	0
West Bremerton		✓	✓		✓	✓	2	2
Gorst		✓	✓		✓	✓	1	1
Port Orchard ³		✓	✓		✓	✓	39	70
ULID #6						✓	0	3
SKIA					✓	✓	1	2

¹Kingston boundaries for all alternatives reflect those approved by the Board of County Commissioners in December 2005. With remand of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan, review of the proposed action would include 3 requests in December 2005 proposed boundaries. This also applies to Alternative 1.

²Some reclass requests made through the Silverdale Sub-Area Plan process involve sites included in the Central Kitsap UGA expansion.

³Gorst Request made with Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plan and with the 10-Year Update. Attributed reclass request to Gorst only.

Employment growth would be accommodated through expansion of employment areas, including mixed use areas. The capacity for new employment would occur in both commercial and industrial designated lands. (See Table 2.6-4 for UGA shares.) Table 2.6-7 summarizes the employment capacity of each alternative on a countywide scale.

Table 2.6-7. Employment Capacity of Alternatives: Countywide Totals

	Alternative 1	Alternative 2	Alternative 3
Projected Industrial Jobs	16,700	22,700	26,900
Projected Commercial Jobs	96,400	111,000	115,600
Total Projected Jobs	113,100	133,700	142,500

Note: See Appendix D for a description of the employment capacity methodology.

On a countywide basis, the amount of land in each land use designation would change as compared to existing conditions, with the amount of land in urban categories, particularly urban residential, increasing, and the amount of land in rural designations decreasing. Table 2.6-8

summarizes the amount of acreage in each land use designation under each alternative. More detailed acre breakdowns can be found in Section 3.2.1, *Land and Shoreline Use*.

Table 2.6-8. Future Land Use Acreage of Alternatives

Plan Designation	Alternative 1		Alternative 2		Alternative 3	
	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total	Acres	Percent of Total
Urban Residential Designations (Urban Restricted, Urban Cluster, Urban Low, Urban Medium, Urban High)	13,064	5.1%	18,837	7.4%	22,024	8.7%
Rural Designations (Rural Residential, Rural Protection, Urban Reserve, Rural Wooded, Forest Resource)	163,624	64.4%	155,981	61.4%	152,689	60.1%
Commercial and Mixed Use Designations – Urban and Rural (Highway/Tourist Commercial, Regional Commercial, Urban Commercial, Urban Town Center, Mixed Use, Urban Village Center, Neighborhood Commercial)	1,789	0.7%	2,649	1.0%	2,746	1.1%
Industrial Designations – Urban and Rural (Industrial, Business Park, Business Center)	4,322	1.7%	3,960	1.6%	5,373	2.1%
Other (e.g., public, mineral overlay, Poulsbo Urban Transition Area, IMPRA, rights of way, cities, Tribal, federal, etc.) ¹	71,367	28.1%	72,752	28.6%	71,346	28.1%
Total	254,167	100%	254,179	100%	254,180	100%

Source: Kitsap County GIS 2006.

It should be noted that in the descriptions of the alternatives, the existing land use designations in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan directly correspond to zoning in the Kitsap County Code (KCC). For the purpose of this DEIS analysis, the land use maps illustrating each of the alternatives use the current Plan land use designation and one new land use designation (Mixed Use). This allows for a review of the more detailed Plan categories that are similar to zoning. The Plan proposes new consolidated Land Use Map designations (described below) and also provides a more detailed zoning map for reference. As proposed in the 10-Year Update, it is anticipated that the Land Use Map designations will be consolidated, particularly in the UGAs. In the rural areas only LAMIRD, commercial, and industrial categories would be consolidated. These categories will reflect the policy intent of the alternative that is chosen for adoption, while simplifying the resulting map. One or more zoning classifications would be available to implement each of the new consolidated Land Use Map designations. Alternative 2 includes amendments to the KCC to implement the policy changes described above. The proposed consolidated Land Use Map designations are shown in Table 2.6-9

Table 2.6-9. Consolidated Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map Designations

Consolidated Comprehensive Plan Land Use Category	Encompasses Which Implementing Zones
Urban Consolidations	
Urban Low Density Residential	Urban Cluster Residential, Urban Restricted, Urban Low Residential
Urban Medium/High Density Residential	Urban Medium Residential, Urban High Residential
Urban Low Intensity Commercial/Mixed Use	Neighborhood Commercial, Urban Village Commercial
Urban High Intensity Commercial/Mixed Use	Highway/Tourist Commercial, Regional Commercial, Urban Commercial ¹ , Urban Town Center, Mixed Use
Urban Industrial	Airport, Business Center, Business Park, Industrial
Rural Consolidations²	
Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs) – George's Corner and Port Gamble	George's Corner and Port Gamble would be designated of LAMIRD (similar to Suquamish and Manchester), with the implementing zones the same as apply today. In George's Corner, the implementing zone is Neighborhood Commercial. In Port Gamble, the implementing zones include Rural Historic Town Commercial, Rural Historic Town Residential, and Rural Historic Town Waterfront.
Rural Commercial	Highway/Tourist Commercial, Neighborhood Commercial
Rural Industrial	Business Park, Industrial
Other Consolidations	
Public Facilities	Combines Parks/Open Space and Public Facilities. Implemented by new Parks Zone for parks/open space properties. Public facilities are allowed in multiple zones.

¹The Urban Commercial designation applies to a minimal amount of acres presently, and would be rezoned to Highway Tourist Commercial.

²Other designations in the rural area would retain their present direct correlation with zoning districts.

Policy Amendments

Alternative 1 (No Action) would maintain current plan policies. Alternatives 2 and 3 would result in policy amendments as shown in Table 2.6-10. Most of the policy topics are similar for Alternatives 2 and 3. The unique policy issues for these alternatives are listed below.

- 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—Alternative 2.
- Allowing increased density ranges for Urban High Residential and commercial zones, up to 30 du/ac instead of 24 du/ac—Alternative 2.
- Revisions of policy and map consolidating Land Use Map designations—Alternative 2.
- Update of greenway and open space policies to match the 2006 Kitsap Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (POS) and any identified corridors (e.g., rural corridor between Silverdale and Central Kitsap) —Alternative 2.

- Update of housing and economic development policies to reflect greater diversity of choices—Alternative 2.
- Update of transportation and capital facility policies—Alternative 2.
- Update of utilities and natural system policies—Alternative 2.
- Update of land use policies, including rural and resource lands policies—Alternative 2.
- Inclusion of population allocation “banking” with respect to the Central Kitsap, East and West Bremerton UGAs—Alternative 2.
- Inclusion of UGA Association and UGA Management Agreement (UGAMA) policies—Alternative 2.
- Revision of the TDR Program policies—Alternatives 2 and 3.
- Inclusion of policies to encourage sewer connections for all new development and/or implementation of new innovative wastewater technologies (i.e., wastewater membrane systems)—Alternative 2.
- Revisions to low impact development (LID) policies—Alternative 2.
- Additions of reasonable measure policies—Alternative 2.
- SKIA sub-area policy amendment for Industrial Multipurpose Recreational Area (IMPRA), and Urban Holding Area—Alternative 2.
- Inclusion of Rural Wooded Incentive Program policies—Alternative 3.

Table 2.6-10. Policy Topics for Alternatives

Chapter/Description	Policy Amendments
Global Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and revise goals, policies, and objectives based on changes to County vision. ▪ Factual updates to background information based on the Inventory, and updates to policies that reference documents to be updated in this process.
Land Use	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Population Projections and Allocations ▪ UGAs ▪ Land Use Map ▪ Residential Development ▪ Commercial Lands ▪ Industrial and Business Lands ▪ Open Space and Greenways 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update policies to reflect Countywide Planning Policy population targets. ▪ Update urban reserve policies as needed; address in Rural Chapter. ▪ Remove joint planning maps and policies establish UGAMA policies. ▪ Consolidate residential and/or commercial land use designations, as well as public facility and park designations, retaining more detailed implementing zoning categories. ▪ Revise Urban Low Residential and Urban Cluster classification density ranges from 5–9 to 4–9 du/ac—Alternative 2 only. ▪ Revise policies to reflect increased density and height ranges for Urban High

Chapter/Description	Policy Amendments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Historic Preservation ▪ Drainage, Flooding, and Stormwater Runoff ▪ Aquifer Recharge Areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> and commercial designations. ▪ Revise policies addressing reasonable measures proposed with alternatives (e.g., minimum density, upzones). ▪ Create new Mixed Use designation policies (e.g., where applied in Silverdale). ▪ Update commercial policies that guide locations (e.g., along highways) and limit new strip commercial, due to sub-area plan processes. ▪ Include UGA Association and UGAMA policies—Alternative 2 and 3. ▪ Include population allocation “banking” as it relates to the Central Kitsap, East and West Bremerton UGAs—Alternative 2. ▪ Encourage master planning of large development parcels. ▪ SKIA IMPRA holding designation policies—Alternative 2 only. ▪ Update greenway and open space policies to match / 2006 Kitsap County Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (POS) and any identified corridors—perhaps rural corridor under Alternative 2 near Silverdale and Central Kitsap. ▪ Review and revise goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater used for public water supplies. ▪ Incorporate a review of drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff in the area and nearby jurisdictions and provide guidance for corrective actions to mitigate or cleanse those discharges that pollute waters of the state, including Puget Sound or waters entering Puget Sound. ▪ Inclusion of policies to encourage sewer connections for all new development and/or implementation of new innovative wastewater technologies (i.e., wastewater membrane systems).
Rural and Resource Lands	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Existing Characteristics and Issues ▪ Rural Lands Goals ▪ Rural Area Designations ▪ Rural Public Services and Facilities ▪ Rural Residential Lands ▪ Rural Communities and Villages ▪ Resource Lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and revise goals, policies, and objectives for consistency with changes to the Land Use Map. ▪ Consolidate LAMIRD categories for Georges Corner and Port Gamble similar to other LAMIRDs. ▪ Review and revise rural goals, policies, and objectives to ensure they identify the general type of permitted land uses that are compatible with rural character and confirm rural governmental service. ▪ Review and revise goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for Rural Wooded Incentive development policies—Alternative 3 only. ▪ TDR policies to support anticipated TDR regulations—Alternatives 2 and 3. ▪ Update mining policies to address reclamation if desired (e.g., Gorst).
Natural Systems	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Geologically Critical Areas ▪ Aquifer Recharge Areas ▪ Surface Water Resources 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and incorporate concepts from the County's POS Plan to minimize habitat fragmentation and preserve critical open spaces. ▪ Review and update goals and policies of the 10-Year Update for consistency with the newly adopted Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) as well as watershed and salmon recovery plans as appropriate

Chapter/Description	Policy Amendments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Frequently Flooded Areas ▪ Plant, Fish, and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas ▪ Air Quality 	
Economic Development	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Economic Development and Diversity ▪ Industrial and Business Land Capacity ▪ Cooperation and Partnership ▪ Education and Job Training ▪ Permit Process ▪ Major Industrial Developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and revise goals and policies, particularly in relation to Chapter 2. <i>Land Use</i>. ▪ SKIA policy review and amendment for UGA expansion and new land use class (Alternative 2). ▪ Greater emphasis on industrial dispersion to other UGAs outside SKIA (e.g., Port Orchard). ▪ Commercial land demand and potential added locations. ▪ Reference to new regional and county priorities (e.g., Prosperity Partnership).
Housing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Housing Needs ▪ Affordability ▪ Housing Supply ▪ Special Needs Housing ▪ Monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review and revise goals, policies, objectives, and mandatory provisions for preservation, improvement, and development of housing in the county. ▪ Review and evaluate means of providing housing for all economic segments of Kitsap County, including policies and implementation for innovative techniques for maintaining housing affordability. ▪ Review and revise policies for incentives to encourage an increase in the availability and affordability of housing. ▪ Accommodation of population targets. ▪ Ability of alternatives to supply diverse housing stock—greater diversity for Alternative 2. ▪ Consider new legislation (HB 2984) regarding affordable housing incentive programs.
Utilities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Inventory of Conditions and Future Needs ▪ Utility Goals and Policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Goals and policies regarding planning for growth. ▪ Goals and policies regarding communication, coordination and cooperation. ▪ New policies regarding development and maintenance of appropriate utility global information system (GIS) data and maps. ▪ New policy regarding striving for data consistency. ▪ New policies for broadband and solar energy. ▪ New goals and policies regarding new technologies (i.e., broadband). ▪ Goals and policies regarding minimizing environmental impacts.

Chapter/Description	Policy Amendments
Transportation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction/Planning Context ▪ Intergovernmental Coordination ▪ Public Awareness and Participation ▪ Mobility ▪ Environmental ▪ Transportation Safety ▪ Economic and Cost Efficiency ▪ Land Use/Transportation Planning ▪ Mass Transit Service and Commute Trip Reduction (CTR) ▪ Marine Transportation Service ▪ Non-motorized Travel ▪ Transportation System Planning and Implementation ▪ Level of Service (LOS) ▪ Roadway Access ▪ Roadway Aesthetics ▪ Funding Strategy ▪ Aviation Transportation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update transit priorities and commitments. ▪ Update city transportation priorities and commitments that could affect county transportation operations. ▪ Add policy regarding the Traffic Safety Program. ▪ Update non-motorized elements. Add policies regarding the Bicycle Facilities Plan, the Mosquito Fleet Trail Master Plan. ▪ Review/update transportation demand management component. ▪ Review/update CTR component. ▪ Review/update implementation guidelines. ▪ Review/update transportation monitoring program. ▪ Update policies based on transportation analysis outcomes (e.g., levels of service, facility needs). Add adopted roadway segment LOS standards as policy. Add policy that supports the development of intersection LOS standards and monitoring of critical intersections.
Shorelines	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction ▪ Planning context ▪ Shoreline environments ▪ Shoreline management master program goals and policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update Introduction. ▪ Incorporate chapter into updated Plan; no policy content changes.
Parks and Recreation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction ▪ Planning context ▪ County's Role ▪ Transition ▪ Acquisition ▪ Management ▪ Funding ▪ Partnerships 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate POS Plan goals, objectives and strategies. No content changes.

Chapter/Description	Policy Amendments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Civic Engagement ▪ Habitat Plan 	
Capital Facilities	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introduction ▪ Goals and Policies ▪ Capital Improvements ▪ Implementation Programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Update capital facilities inventory as well as 6-year funding strategies. ▪ Updates to policies identifying service providers. ▪ Policy updates related to levels of service as appropriate. ▪ Update policies based on Capital Facilities Plan analysis outcomes (e.g., levels of service, facility needs). ▪ Inclusion of policies to encourage sewer connections for all new development and/or implementation of new innovative wastewater technologies (i.e., wastewater membrane systems).
Sub-Area Plans	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate adopted and in-process sub-area plans into chapters.
Community Plans	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Incorporate portions of the citizen sponsored Illahee Community Plan into its own chapter.
Implementation Element	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ New chapter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Compile recommendations from elements and ensure that responsibilities and interconnected actions are identified.

Regulatory Amendments

Plan maps and policies are implemented by development regulations including zoning, subdivision, and other regulations. Table 2.6-11 identifies the proposed regulation amendments analyzed in this DEIS in association with the alternatives. The proposed regulation amendments identified in Table 2.6-11 are included in Volume III: Proposed Regulations. In addition to land use and dimensional changes are proposed amendments to improve the clarity, consistency and functionality of existing development regulations (e.g., Title 16 – Land Division and Development, Title 17 - Zoning, Chapter 18.04 -SEPA, Title 21 - Land Use and Development Procedures). Volume III contains a detailed list of regulatory changes that meet the intents described below by the regulation topics.

Table 2.6-11. Potential Regulation Topics – Address in 10-Year Update/DEIS Analysis

Regulation Topic	Alternative
1. Revise development regulations to bring them into consistency with the 10-Year Update and related sub-area plans (e.g., area-wide rezones, zoning regulations, SEPA regulations).	
<i>Land Use Regulations</i>	
1.a. Areawide rezones to implement land use designations. Includes new zones such as Mixed Use, Parks, and Urban Holding Area.	Alternative 2
1.b. New Mixed Use zone and designation, for Silverdale, East and West Bremerton and Central, and related development regulations (e.g., density, setbacks, height, design criteria).	Alternative 2
1.c. Revisions to some rarely used commercial designations (e.g., Urban Commercial).	Alternative 2
1.d. New consolidated use table, including 10-Year regulation topics noted above, consolidated land use designations, and revised zones.	Alternative 2
<i>Density, Dimension and Design Regulations</i>	
1.e. Revisions to minimum densities in urban areas, including exemptions.	Alternative 2
1.f. Revisions to <i>countywide</i> maximum height limits and new incentive provisions to exceed height limits.	Alternative 2
1.g. Revisions to maximum densities in some multifamily, commercial, and mixed use zones.	Alternative 2
1.h. New consolidated density and dimensions table, including 10-Year regulation topics noted above and new Silverdale sub-area density and dimension regulations.	Alternative 2
1.i. New design review process for implementation of new Silverdale Downtown Design Guidelines.	Alternative 2
<i>SEPA Regulations</i>	
1.j. SEPA categorical exemptions for mixed use and infill development in the Silverdale UGA and increased thresholds for SEPA categorical exemptions.	Alternative 2
2. Revise other potential development regulations identified during public review of DEIS and 10-Year Update.	Alternative dependent on topic(s), if any, to be identified later in public review process
3. Revise development regulations to ensure that the Rural Wooded polices are implemented consistent with the direction of prior CPSGMHB orders (e.g., development regulations to implement Rural Wooded clustering goals and polices and clarify program parameters).	Alternative 3
4. In tandem with policy updates, revise development regulations that address urban/rural growth levels and reasonable measures, such as TDR programs.	Alternatives 2 and 3
5. 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.).	Alternative 2

Two regulatory amendments would modify the environmental review process for site-specific developments. The first is intended to facilitate the permit process for minor new construction in unconstrained areas and would raise general categorical thresholds for minor new construction. The second would allow an exemption for infill/mixed use in Silverdale. Each is described further below.

SEPA Categorical Exemption Thresholds for Minor New Construction

Some land use and building activities are exempt from SEPA due to their small size and lack of likelihood to result in significant adverse impacts. WAC SEPA rules allow cities and counties to raise the exemption limit for minor new construction to better accommodate the needs in their jurisdiction. For example, cities and counties may choose to exempt residential developments at any level between 4 and 20 dwelling units. The exemption for commercial buildings can range from 4,000 to 12,000 square feet. Under Alternative 2, the County's SEPA rules would be amended to raise thresholds for SEPA categorical exemptions. Table 2.6-12 identifies the current categorical exemption level and the proposed new thresholds. Appendix F provides a list of adopted regulations in place in KCCs that would serve to mitigate impacts of development, whether subject to SEPA or not.

Table 2.6-12. Existing and Proposed SEPA Thresholds for Minor New Construction

Use/ Activity	Current Exemption Threshold	Proposed Exemption Threshold
Construction/location of residential structures	4 dwelling units	9 dwelling units total, in urban areas 4 dwelling units in total, in rural areas (same as current exemption threshold)
Construction of a barn, loafing shed, farm equipment storage building, produce storage or packing structure, or similar agricultural structure, to be used only by the property owner or his or her agent in the conduct of farming the property. This exemption shall not apply to feed lots.	10,000 square feet	15,000 square feet (footprint)
Construction of an office, school, commercial, recreational, service, or storage building, and associated parking	4,000 square feet of gross floor area; associated parking facilities for 20 automobiles	8,000 square feet; 40 automobiles.
Construction of a parking lot	20 automobiles	40 automobiles
Any landfill or excavation throughout the total lifetime of the fill or excavation; and any fill or excavation classified as a Class I, II, or III forest practice under RCW 76.09.050	100 cubic yards	500 cubic yards outside of shoreline jurisdiction; 150 cubic yards in shoreline jurisdiction

RCW = Revised Code of Washington

These exemptions do not apply when a rezone or any license governing emissions to the air or discharges to water is required, nor when a proposal includes a series of non-exempt actions that cumulatively have a probable significant adverse impact, nor when a proposal is in a critical area and the jurisdiction has eliminated categorical exemptions for proposals in critical areas. Where exemptions do apply, other KCC requirements for transportation, stormwater, and other issues will continue to apply, per Appendix F.

SEPA Mixed Use/Infill Categorical Exemption

SEPA allows a categorical exemption for new residential or mixed use development if the development is within a UGA and current density/intensity of use is lower than called for in the goals and polices of the comprehensive plan, provided the plan was previously subjected to environmental analysis through an EIS. This mixed use/infill exemption is proposed for application in the downtown Silverdale area (Figure 2.6-11). The criteria for the exemption are listed below.

1. Must be limited to new residential or mixed use development within a designated UGA.
2. Existing density/intensity of use in the UGA must be lower than that called for in the comprehensive plan.
3. An EIS must have been completed for the adoption of the comprehensive plan.
4. Proposed development must not exceed the density/intensity of use called for in the comprehensive plan.

Table 2.6-13 compares the parameters of the mixed use/infill assumptions for the applicable area for purposes of the SEPA analysis in downtown Silverdale with countywide code amendments proposed for height and density in multifamily and commercial zones. Industrial zones are not listed on the table, but would have one change in dimensions, which is to allow the possibility of buildings heights at 50 feet, up from the base height of 35 feet. Table 2.6-14 lists the design guidelines for the individual design districts in downtown Silverdale. The focused growth in downtown Silverdale would help support its designation as a Regional Growth Center (shown in Figure 2-12 together with the proposed Alternative 2 UGA boundaries)

Table 2.6-13. Proposed EIS Assumptions for Zoning Districts Countywide and within the Silverdale Mixed Use/Infill Exemption Area

	Adopted Urban Village Center Zone Standards	Proposed Zoning District Amendments					
		New Mixed Use Assumptions	Neighborhood Commercial	Highway Tourist Commercial	Regional Commercial	Urban High	Urban Medium
Residential Density	Up to 18 du/ac	<i>Countywide:</i> up to 30 du/ac <i>Silverdale:</i> 10–30 du/ac	<i>Countywide:</i> 10–30 du/ac <i>Silverdale:</i> 30 du/ac in Downtown	<i>Countywide:</i> 10–30 du/ac <i>Silverdale:</i> 30 du/ac in Downtown	<i>Countywide:</i> 10–30 du/ac <i>Silverdale:</i> 30 du/ac in Downtown	<i>Countywide:</i> 19–30 du/ac <i>Silverdale:</i> 30 du/ac in Downtown	<i>Countywide:</i> 10–18 du/ac <i>Silverdale:</i> 10–18 du/ac
Non-residential Intensity	25,000 sf/structure	<i>Countywide and Silverdale:</i> Up to 60,000 sf/structure ¹	No limit, except by height and setback standards	No limit, except by height and setback standards	No limit, except by height and setback standards	Not applicable	Not applicable
Mix of Uses	Residential use must be no more than 2/3 of the total proposed gross floor area; phasing allowed	<i>Countywide and Silverdale:</i> Residential use must be no more than 2/3 of the total proposed gross floor area; phasing allowed	Not applicable	Not applicable	Mix of uses not specified, except no residential on ground floor	Not applicable	Not applicable
Structure Height	45'	<i>Countywide:</i> 65' ² <i>Silverdale:</i> In Downtown Silverdale, follow Design Guidelines.	<i>Countywide:</i> 45' <i>Silverdale:</i> In Downtown Silverdale, follow Design Guidelines.	<i>Countywide:</i> 65' <i>Silverdale:</i> In Downtown Silverdale, follow Design Guidelines.	<i>Countywide:</i> 65' <i>Silverdale:</i> In Downtown Silverdale, follow Design Guidelines.	<i>Countywide:</i> 65' <i>Silverdale:</i> In Downtown Silverdale, follow Design Guidelines.	<i>Countywide:</i> 45' <i>Silverdale:</i> In Downtown Silverdale, follow Design Guidelines.
Impervious Surface Coverage	Based on landscape requirements: max 85%	<i>Countywide:</i> Based on landscape requirements: max. 85%	<i>Countywide:</i> Based on landscape requirements: max 85%	<i>Countywide:</i> Based on landscape requirements: max 85%	<i>Countywide:</i> Based on landscape requirements: max 85%	<i>Countywide:</i> Based on landscape requirements: max 85%	<i>Countywide:</i> Based on landscape requirements: max 85%

¹Size threshold to minimize potential for “big box” development.

²Allows for up to 4 stories at an average floor height of 15'

du/ac = dwelling unites per acre

Table 2.6-14. Silverdale Downtown Design Guidelines by District

	Old Town Center	Bucklin Hill Center	Clear Creek Village	Kitsap Mall Center	Northeast Business District	West Hill Neighborhood	Waterfront District
Density	Based on zone	Based on zone	Based on zone	Based on zone	Based on zone	8–20 southern part 12–25 northern part	Based on zone
Building Height	35', 1–3 stories	45' (village & community campus) 65' – 85' (gateway)	45'; 1–4 stories	65'	Office park 65" Warehouse parks 45' North of SR-303, based on residential zone	65'	35'
Uses	Residential, retail, office, live-work, mixed use	<i>Village:</i> Preferred: stacked flats above retail, townhouses above one story flats, courtyard housing <i>Campus:</i> residential and mixed uses oriented around greens/walkways <i>Gateway:</i> Office, lodging and entertainment	Retail, residential, mixed use	Regional shopping center, expanded to include office, retail, residential. A mixed use center.	Office parks, warehouse parks, and some low density residential	Multiplexes, row house, mixed use with live-work or small retail and commercial uses	Similar to West Hill

It is anticipated that the SEPA exemption will be administered generally according to the steps shown below.

- Create a “bank” of dwelling units and square footage/employees assumed and/or of traffic trips.
- Individual residential/mixed use development proposals within the defined location may use trips up to the maximum in the “bank” on a first-come first-served basis.

Like the general SEPA thresholds for minor new construction, the mixed use/infill exemption will not apply in the following circumstances.

- The proposal is a segment of a proposal that contains both exempt and non-exempt actions.
- The jurisdiction determines that the proposal includes a series of non-exempt actions that cumulatively have a probable significant adverse impact.

- The proposal is in a critical area where the jurisdiction has eliminated categorical exemptions for proposals in critical areas.

Additional guidelines may apply.

Description Alternatives

Alternative 1—No Action

Alternative 1 is the No-Action Alternative; it assumes continuation of the current Comprehensive Plan. Goals, policies, land use designations and zoning, and UGA boundaries would remain as they were established in December 2005. Alternative 1 would not include changes to accommodate population growth allocations for 2025 as specified in the CPPs. It would include the capacity for approximately 11,474 housing units, 28,361 new persons, and approximately 20,000 jobs within the Kitsap County UGAs. 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. It would not meet the population growth target for the planning area as a whole. See Table 2.6-5 for a comparison of population and housing unit growth and the CPP population target under each alternative. The ULCA indicates that the Kingston UGA would accommodate about 488 persons more than the population target. The ULID #6 UGA updated land capacity information indicates that the boundaries are sized for about 1,522 persons more than the target.

Alternative 1 continues the strategy for growth that was formulated as part of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. This alternative would not alter UGA boundaries beyond December 2005 limits, increase allowed densities, or increase the amount of land available for mixed use and infill development in any of the UGAs. The UGAs would continue to encompass approximately 38.4 square miles of land.

The types of new housing units constructed under this alternative would be similar to those developed over the past 8 years. In UGAs, units would be primarily single family (87% of total additional dwellings); multifamily dwellings would constitute the remaining 13%. Densities for new single-family residential development in low-density areas within the UGAs would be 5–9 du/ac. Alternative 1 does not include adoption of sub-area plans for the Silverdale or Port Orchard/ULID #6 areas, but does assume adoption of the Kingston Sub-Area Plan. Land use reclassification requests are not assumed to occur (except in Kingston as part of the December 2005 plan). See Tables 2.6-3 through 2.6-6 for a comparison of changes to UGA boundaries, densities, and land use reclassification requests under the alternatives. Based on the rural population 2025 target, 8,168 dwellings are projected in rural areas, predominantly on rural residential lands.

Employment growth under Alternative 1 would be accommodated through existing Industrial, Business Park, Business Center, and Commercial designations. Intensification on buildable acres

could occur within all UGAs, but particularly in the SKIA, Silverdale, and Port Orchard UGAs. Employment associated with industrial and commercial land uses would continue to increase as remaining lands are developed. See Tables 2.6-4 and 2.6-7 for a comparison of the employment capacity of the UGAs under each alternative.

The amount of land in each land use designation would not change under Alternative 1. See Table 2.6-8 for a comparison of acreage in each land use designation under the alternatives.

Under Alternative 1, changes to the Rural Wooded Incentive Program would not occur, and a TDR program would not be established. Categorical exemptions from further environmental review would not be established for minor new construction countywide or mixed use and infill development within the Silverdale UGA.

Alternative 2—Intermediate UGA Expansion

Alternative 2 would revise Plan goals and policies, UGA boundaries, and the Land Use Map to include the capacity for approximately 15,038 housing units, 36,448 new persons, and about 38,000 jobs within the Kitsap County UGAs. This alternative would achieve a population level about 5% below the CPP population growth target for the planning area as a whole. All nine UGAs with population growth targets have less capacity than the target to varying degrees. Table 2.6-5 compares the CPP population and housing unit capacity of the alternatives for each UGA.

Alternative 2 would nearly accommodate the targeted population growth primarily by increasing the allowed density within specific portions of the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, Gorst, and Port Orchard UGAs, including increases in the amount of land available for mixed use and infill development. Alternative 2 would also include intermediate expansion of certain UGA boundaries (Poulsbo, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, West Bremerton, Gorst, and Port Orchard) and a larger expansion of the SKIA UGA, described further below. The Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGA boundaries would contract at their joint boundary in the Barker Creek corridor. The UGAs would encompass approximately 51.8 square miles of land, an increase of approximately 35%. UGA expansions would generally reflect lot patterns and environmental constraints, and would substantially meet the CPP target. Population not yet accommodated may be “banked” to allow for joint planning with other jurisdictions or potential CPP amendments to reallocate population, as needed.

Alternative 2 would concentrate housing and population growth in growth nodes. This alternative would provide the capacity for a greater variety of new housing unit types than is currently allowed. In UGAs, housing would consist primarily of single-family unit types (78%); but there would be a greater percentage of multifamily housing than under other alternatives (22%), and densities would range from 4–30 du/ac. Allowed densities for new single-family residential development in Urban Low and Urban Cluster areas within the UGAs would be reduced somewhat, to 4–9 du/ac; Urban Restricted would equal 1–4 du/ac. Higher-density residential/mixed use zones would allow up to 30 du/ac in some locations rather than the current maximum of 24 du/ac. Minimum densities would be established for residential development

within all urban zones, and future countywide densities would be expected to meet CPSGMHB urban density requirements.

Alternative 2 reflects the priority study areas/recommended land use plans studied by the Port Orchard/South Kitsap CAG. For Silverdale, significant portions of the Alternative 2 reflects the CACs recommended land use plan, with the exception of a revision to low-density residential adjacent to the Chico Creek estuary and exclusion of the Barker Creek corridor. Alternative 2 also includes some land use concepts of the citizen-sponsored Illahee Community Plan. Land use redesignation requests for 83 properties are also assumed to occur under this alternative. See Tables 2.6-3 through 2.6-6 for a comparison of densification, UGA boundary changes, and land use redesignations under the alternatives.

Employment growth under this alternative would be accommodated through intensification within specific employment and mixed use areas. Some Industrial-designated land along State Route (SR) 3 within the Silverdale UGA would be converted to Highway Tourist Commercial and Regional Commercial designations. The Silverdale UGA boundary would expand to include more land designated for Business Center and Regional Commercial uses, allowing a mix of light industrial, office, and technology uses as well as commercial (in the appropriate zone). The Port Orchard UGA would also contain more land under commercial and industrial classifications.

A new land use designation, IMPRA, is proposed in the SKIA area. The designation would be an urban designation (i.e., within the urban growth boundary), and would be reserved for development of employment uses, such as a speedway or other unique recreational uses. No development could occur until certain criteria, specified in policies, are met, to provide for a subsequent detailed planning process. As a prerequisite to development, proposed policies require that a master plan and development agreement be approved. The master plan would identify, at a minimum, the general location of uses, access, project phasing, and infrastructure to serve the development. The development agreement would include a list of allowed uses and development standards and would be adopted as the zoning regulation for the area of the master plan. Approval of the development regulations would be legislative; this approach would ensure full public process. The policies would also require issuance of a project-level SEPA analysis, in accordance with SEPA rules, for the master plan and implementing zoning and development regulations. Through the master plan and SEPA analysis, capital facilities needs and impacts would be evaluated. The County could update the Capital Facilities Plan (Volume I, Appendix A) based on the analysis in the site-specific environmental review. The process would ensure that sufficient capital facilities planning can occur at a project level. Given the speculative nature of future development, the policies include a sunset provision and a termination clause. Provisions may be included that would require a determination at intervals that the project is progressing as envisioned in the master plan. If County decision makers deny the proposal, if the work on the project ceases, if progress does not meet the time frames outlined in the policies, or if the project is substantially changed from the uses proposed in the master plan, the site would revert to the prior land use designation and zoning (i.e., the current SKIA land uses under Alternative 1).

As under Alternative 1, all UGAs would see some employment gains, but SKIA, Port Orchard, and Silverdale (in that order) would experience the most significant gains. See Tables 2.6-4 and 2.6-7 above for a general comparison of employment capacity under the alternatives.

On a countywide basis, the amount of land in urban uses would increase and the amount of land in rural uses would decrease. However, UGA boundaries would increase and rural areas would decrease less than under Alternative 3. (See Table 2.6-8 for a comparison.)

Alternative 2 would result in the policy amendments listed below.

- 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.
- Allowing increased density ranges for Urban High Residential and commercial zones, up to 30 du/ac instead of 24 du/ac.
- Revisions of policy and map to consolidate Land Use Map categories.
- Update of greenway and open space policies to match the POS Plan and any identified corridors (e.g., rural corridor between Silverdale and Central Kitsap).
- Update of housing and economic development policies to reflect greater diversity of choices.
- Update of transportation and capital facility policies.
- Update of utilities and natural system policies.
- Update of land use policies, including rural and resource lands.
- Inclusion of population allocation “banking” with respect to the Central Kitsap, East and West Bremerton UGAs.
- Inclusion of UGA Association and UGAMA policies.
- Revision of the TDR Program policies.
- Inclusion of policies to encourage sewer connections for all new development and/or implementation of new innovative wastewater technologies (i.e., wastewater membrane systems).
- Revisions to LID policies.
- Additions of reasonable measure policies.
- SKIA sub-area policy for IMPRA, and Urban Holding Area.

Additional policy amendments are listed in Table 2.6-10.

Under Alternative 2, the following regulation amendments are proposed.

- Areawide redesignation and rezones to implement Land Use Map and policy changes.
- Density and dimension amendments to match policy/map changes in Chapter 2, *Land Use*.
- New mixed use zone, parks zone, and urban holding area.
- Consolidation of some commercial categories.
- Consolidation Use Table in Title 17.
- Minimum densities in urban areas.
- Revisions to maximum height restrictions in some multifamily, commercial, mixed use, and industrial zones.
- Categorical exemptions from further environmental review for minor new construction countywide, and for mixed use and infill development within the Silverdale UGA.
- 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).
- New TDR regulations.

See also Table 2.6-11.

Under GMA, a TDR program would help direct new growth away from rural lands and toward urbanizing areas where urban services are both appropriate and efficiently provided. Development rights would be purchased by either developers or individuals seeking rezone applications or site-specific comprehensive plan changes and used to increase the density of development (or to allow for greater commercial floor area or increased or reduced parking requirements) on a receiving site. (It is anticipated that the purchase would be between willing sellers and buyers in private transactions.) They would be incorporated into the site-specific review process or development permit review process, and the new units would be permitted under the standard permit review process. Proposed sending and receiving areas are identified below.

- The proposed sending areas would include the 54,000 acres consisting of the IRF Lands, zoned IRF, areas identified as significant landscape or habitat features, environmentally sensitive (critical) areas, scenic views, rural character, and open space corridors. Sending area maps and parcel lists would be updated annually.
- The proposed receiving area is made up of the Silverdale UGA; the cities of Poulsbo, Port Orchard, and Bainbridge Island; and Bremerton's incorporated and unincorporated UGA. The proposed receiving areas would also include the unincorporated Central Kitsap, Gorst, ULID#6, and SKIA UGAs. Landowners may place development rights onto a receiving site either by transferring them from a qualifying parcel they own or by purchasing the development rights from a qualified sending site landowner. With transferred development

rights and a site-specific rezone application, a landowner may develop the receiving site at a higher density than previously allowed by the former zoning. Further environmental review under SEPA would be required for a rezone.

This alternative would also allow for categorical exemptions from further environmental review for minor new construction countywide, and for mixed use and infill development in the Silverdale UGA. Please see Tables 2.6-12 through 2.6-14 for additional information.

Alternative 3—Largest UGA Expansion

Alternative 3 would revise UGA boundaries and the Land Use Map to include the capacity for approximately 22,054 housing units, 54,614 new persons, and about 47,000 jobs within the Kitsap County UGAs. This alternative would exceed the CPP population growth target for the planning area as a whole, and for seven of the nine UGAs that have population targets; it would provide population to a tenth UGA that does not have a population allocation. The population capacity would exceed the target in the Kingston, Silverdale, Gorst, Port Orchard, and ULID #6 UGAs; would be slightly above the target in the Poulsbo and West Bremerton UGAs; and would be under the target in the Central Kitsap and East Bremerton UGAs. Table 2.6-5 compares the CPP population and housing unit capacity of the alternatives for each UGA.

Alternative 3 would accommodate the targeted population growth through expansion of UGA boundaries while retaining the existing emphasis on single-family residential development patterns. In addition to the UGAs that would be expanded under Alternative 2, Alternative 3 would expand the ULID #6 UGA. SKIA would be expanded similar to Alternative 2 but for Business Center uses. UGA expansions would generally be larger than those under Alternative 2 to encompass more land area. Under Alternative 3, the UGAs would encompass approximately 57.6 square miles of land, an increase of approximately 50%.

This alternative would entail less upzoning and fewer opportunities for mixed use development than Alternative 2, but more than Alternative 1 (No Action). Upzones would occur within the same UGAs as under Alternative 2, but would allow somewhat less intensive uses. Alternative 3 would call for less concentration of housing and population in growth nodes. The majority of new housing units would be single-family units, although densities for new single-family residential development in low-density areas within the UGAs would not be reduced. In UGAs, growth in single-family unit types would be the greatest of the three alternatives. In terms of ratios, single-family units would predominate (87% of total additional dwellings) with a lower percentage of units in multifamily (13%) similar to Alternative 1. Densities of new residential development would range from 5–24 du/ac. As under Alternative 2, future countywide densities would be expected to meet CPSGMHB urban density requirements. Alternative 3 reflects the maximum land use plans studied by the Silverdale and Port Orchard/South Kitsap CACs. Land use reclassification requests for 120 properties are assumed to occur under this alternative. See Tables 2.6-3 through 2.6-6 for a comparison of densification, UGA boundary changes, and site-specific land use redesignations under the alternatives.

Employment growth under this alternative would be accommodated through expansion of the SKIA UGA to include several hundred more acres of Business Center area, allowing a mix of light industrial, office, and technology uses than under the other alternatives. The Silverdale UGA would expand to include more Business Center and Regional Commercial land, and some of this UGA's Industrial-designated land would be converted to the Highway Tourist Commercial. Overall, there would be fewer mixed use nodes that allow commercial employment uses near higher-density residential uses than under Alternative 2. Employment is focused to a greater degree in the SKIA, Port Orchard, and Silverdale UGAs. See Tables 2.3-4 and 2.3-7 above for a comparison of employment capacity under the alternatives.

On a countywide basis, the amount of land in urban uses would increase and rural uses would decrease the most of any studied alternative. (See Table 2.6-8 for a comparison.)

Under Alternative 3, a Rural Wooded Incentive Program would apply, allowing cluster development at a range of densities—from 1–5 du/20ac—depending on the percentage of open space retained and the period of time protected. The program would first apply to 5,000 acres; once monitored, the program could be extended to a greater area designated Rural Wooded.

- Under Alternative 3, TDR is being considered to conserve significant landscape or habitat features, environmentally sensitive areas, scenic views, rural character, and open space corridors. (See the discussion under Alternative 2.)

Based on the rural population allocation, 8,168 dwellings are projected in rural areas, predominantly in rural residential lands, but for purposes of this DEIS, one-third of these are assumed to be on Rural Wooded land pursuant to the proposed policies and regulations.

2.6.4. Alternatives Eliminated from Consideration

SEPA encourages nonproject EIS documents to focus on alternative means of accomplishing objectives. While a range of alternatives should be evaluated in a nonproject EIS, a jurisdiction "...is not required under SEPA to examine all conceivable policies, designations, or implementation measures but should cover a range of such topics" (WAC 197-11-442[4]).

The range of alternatives analyzed in this DEIS is intended to meet SEPA requirements, as well as to test a range of choices considering the GMA planning framework and County objectives in Section 2.6.2, *Proposal Objectives*. The GMA framework requires the County to accommodate OFM 20-year population allocations in a manner that allows for urban-level densities, reduces potential for sprawl, gives a range of housing choices and employment opportunities, protects rural areas and natural/environmental resources, and allows for provision of public services within financial means.

The DEIS alternatives essentially test the level of infill development, the level of urban land expansion, and the resulting population and employment capacity of proposed land use designations. Under each of these parameters, the DEIS alternatives test a range of choices.

The choices listed below were eliminated from consideration under each parameter.

- Population growth levels at the low or high OFM projections. The 10-Year Update strives to meet the OFM mid-range projection that was adopted by the BOCC and ratified by cities in the CPPs.
- Density levels at 3 du/ac as a blanket average density allowance. In *Bremerton v. Kitsap County*, October 1995, the CPSGMHB found that, as a general rule, 4 du/ac or more constitutes urban densities. A pattern of 1- and 2-1/2-acre lots is a sprawl pattern that should not occur in rural and urban areas. This case is specific to Kitsap County. The alternatives tested in the DEIS apply Urban Low Residential at either 4–9 or 5–9 du/ac, subject to sewer provision or alternative wastewater technology, to provide for urban densities and to allow for cost-effective service delivery. Where there are significant complexes of critical areas, the Urban Restricted designation is applied under the alternatives; this designation allows for densities of 1–4 du/ac (under Alternative 2; it is 1–5 du/ac under Alternatives 1 or 3), dependent on a case-by-case review of feasibility.
- Infill and expansion levels that consider only infill or only expansion to accommodate growth. The feasibility of accommodating growth solely through intensification is limited in some UGAs given the amount of developable lands, environmental constraints, the urban character variations among UGA jurisdictions, and their respective community visions, among other factors. The feasibility of accommodating growth solely through UGA expansion is also low in view of GMA requirements to focus growth in urban areas, reduce sprawl, and protect environmental and resource lands.
- Major amendments to rural areas. As discussed above, the amendments to the Plan evaluated in this DEIS would primarily affect the urban portions of unincorporated Kitsap County. Some changes, such as the LAMIRD designation consolidation, are proposed, but rural area amendments are a lesser focus in the 10-Year Update. Land Use Map designations and policies affecting rural areas are anticipated to be addressed in 2007 through an annual amendment process. At that time, sub-area plans under development for certain rural areas could also be considered. Concurrent with the 2007 annual amendments to the Plan, other amendments may occur as needed for consistency with the revised Plan. Environmental review at an appropriate level of detail for these future amendments would occur at that time.

2.6.5. Future Alternatives

It is likely that, as a result of additional evaluation by the County and community, a final preferred alternative will be developed based the Plan objectives/vision that falls within range of the alternatives analyzed herein. This DEIS evaluates alternatives conceptualized as of July 2006 to analyze options that were fixed at that time to allow the environmental review to help further refine the draft Plan. A final alternative will be developed after public hearings and will be evaluated as a part of the Final EIS.

2.6.6. Benefits and Disadvantages of Delaying the Proposed Action

SEPA requires a discussion of the benefits and disadvantages of reserving, for some future time, the implementation of a proposal compared to possible approval at this time. In other words, the County must consider the possibility of foreclosing future options by implementing the proposal.

There are several benefits to adopting a comprehensive plan that includes new population forecasts and updated policies and programs.

- Greater range of housing choices and a diversified employment base.
- Coordinated planning among jurisdictions.
- Updated capital facility plans that respond to future growth.
- Opportunity for grants and funding of needed projects and facilities.
- Guidance of development and County resource allocations to meet forecast trends along with the community vision.

Delaying implementation would allow for growth to occur on the basis of the current Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations; however, it would not meet CPSGMHB requirements to complete a 10-Year Update and to accommodate growth to 2025.

Delaying implementation of the Proposed Action could delay natural environment impacts on lands associated with UGA expansions under Alternatives 2 and 3, because these expansion areas would not yet be identified for more intense uses: However, the delay could also increase development pressure on rural lands adjacent to original UGA boundaries as land inside the boundaries is developed. The current Comprehensive Plan, capital plans, and development regulations assume a planning period of 1998–2017 and would not result in coordinated land use and capital planning. Moreover, the current plans would not provide an opportunity to consider more recent trends since the plan was adopted in 1998, nor would they facilitate refinement of the long-range plan course.