

**KITSAP COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
Preliminary Alternative Comparative Analysis**

Kitsap County has been required to update its Comprehensive Plan to address issues with minimum allowed residential densities and land capacity calculations. To address these issues, Kitsap County assessed recent development trends (2000-2010) and market conditions and analyzed the validity of land capacity assumptions based upon current local circumstances. From these assessments, Kitsap County prepared four preliminary alternatives for each of the eight affected urban growth areas. These alternative boundaries are based upon different projected density trends and other land capacity assumptions. Below is a summary of the land capacity assumptions used in each of the four preliminary alternatives for each of the eight affected UGAs. These alternatives are intended to test different density projections for the Urban Low, Urban Cluster and Urban Restricted zones while also assessing the validity of the current public facilities reductions (area dedicated to stormwater ponds and infrastructure other than roadways) and the unavailable lands deduction (lands that will not develop by 2025 by personal choice of the land owner or market conditions).

DENSITY TRENDS AND LAND CAPACITY ASSUMPTIONS (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)				
FEATURE	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4 (NO ACTION)
Ability to Accommodate Growth Targets (Future Population)	Some UGAs Undersized	Approximately Equal to Targets	Approximately Equal to Targets	Most UGAs Significantly Oversized
Trends: Urban Low (UL) Zone Previously calculated at 4 dwelling units per acre	6.5 Dwelling Units Per Acre <i>Based upon the increasingly high cost of public infrastructure (sewer lines and pump stations, roads and stormwater facilities) which will continue to drive densities higher for new development. This may be particularly true in small infill developments which will become a larger percentage of the overall development pattern.</i>	6.0 Dwelling Units Per Acre <i>Based upon the documented developed densities of all long and short plats between 2000 and 2010. This time period includes both pre and post real estate bubble patterns. These densities reflect recent local development realities for Kitsap County.</i>	6.0 Dwelling Units Per Acre <i>Based upon the documented developed densities of all long and short plats between 2000 and 2010. This time period includes both pre and post real estate bubble patterns. These densities reflect recent local development realities for Kitsap County.</i>	5.6 Dwelling Units Per Acre <i>Assumes the real estate bubble and subsequent bust artificially drove densities higher to serve a market that was previously unable to purchase homes. The new mortgage realities limit these consumers' abilities to receive a loan to purchase this housing stock. With an abundance of higher density lots and a limited consumer demand for them, new housing stock will need to be developed to address the changing market. This market may seek larger urban lots consistent with the pre-bubble density trends of 2000-2005.</i>

DENSITY TRENDS AND LAND CAPACITY ASSUMPTIONS (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)

FEATURE	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4 (NO ACTION)
<p>Trends: Urban Cluster (UC) Zone Previously calculated at 4 dwelling units per acre</p>	<p align="center">7.6 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>The Urban Cluster zone was established for large tracts in single ownerships for large-scale developments. Virtually all the land in this zone has been platted and is progressing towards development. The approved densities of the preliminary plats provide a clear picture of their future development.</i></p>	<p align="center">7.6 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>The Urban Cluster zone was established for large tracts in single ownerships for large-scale developments. Virtually all the land in this zone has been platted and is progressing towards development. The approved densities of the preliminary plats provide a clear picture of their future development.</i></p>	<p align="center">7.6 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>The Urban Cluster zone was established for large tracts in single ownerships for large-scale developments. Virtually all the land in this zone has been platted and is progressing towards development. The approved densities of the preliminary plats provide a clear picture of their future development.</i></p>	<p align="center">7.6 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>The Urban Cluster zone was established for large tracts in single ownerships for large-scale developments. Virtually all the land in this zone has been platted and is progressing towards development. The approved densities of the preliminary plats provide a clear picture of their future development.</i></p>
<p>Trends: Urban Restricted (UR) Zone Previously calculated at 1 dwelling unit per acre</p>	<p align="center">5 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>Documented densities in the UR zone have crested 8 dwelling units per acre during the 2000-2010 time period. Infrastructure costs that may affect development of the Urban Low may also affect UR. Even with a 2008 code change to limit densities based upon site constraints such as critical areas, densities of this zone may trend towards to top of the range.</i></p>	<p align="center">2.5 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>Density patterns of much of the 2000-2010 time period showed higher net densities for the UR zone. These development patterns are far above those promoted for this environmentally-sensitive urban zone. In 2008, this pattern was corrected by amending the maximum density providing a hard cap of 5 dwelling units per net acre. With this code change, the fact that densities are prescribed by the environmental limitations of the land and that much of the easily developed UR lands have already done so, future densities may trend to the middle of density range (1-5).</i></p>	<p align="center">2.5 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>Density patterns of much of the 2000-2010 time period showed higher net densities for the UR zone. These development patterns are far above those promoted for this environmentally-sensitive urban zone. In 2008, this pattern was corrected by amending the maximum density providing a hard cap of 5 dwelling units per net acre. With this code change, the fact that densities are prescribed by the environmental limitations of the land and that much of the easily developed UR lands have already done so, future densities may trend to the middle of density range (1-5).</i></p>	<p align="center">2.5 Dwelling Units Per Acre</p> <p><i>Density patterns of much of the 2000-2010 time period, showed higher net densities for the UR zone. These development patterns are far above those promoted for this environmentally-sensitive urban zone. In 2008, this pattern was corrected by amending the maximum density providing a hard cap of 5 dwelling units per net acre. With this code change, the fact that densities are prescribed by the environmental limitations of the land and that much of the easily developed UR lands have already done so, future densities may trend to the middle of density range (1-5).</i></p>

DENSITY TRENDS AND LAND CAPACITY ASSUMPTIONS (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)

FEATURE	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4 (NO ACTION)
Unavailable Lands Deduction	<p align="center">5% Vacant land 15% Underutilized</p> <p><i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology.</i></p>	<p align="center">5% Vacant 20% Underutilized</p> <p><i>A comparison of unavailable land deductions and market factors region-wide showed Kitsap County's was amongst the lowest in the region (25% for both vacant and underutilized is common). With the housing market in a substantial flux and projections of the 2006 land capacity analysis out of date, a revision to land not expected to develop by 2025 may be prudent. These shifting boom and bust market conditions may have an impact of the willingness of owners with underutilized land (land developed but not to the density of urban zone) to sell their land for redevelopment or redevelop it themselves by 2025. Additional analysis will be conducted in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to determine appropriate market factor reductions.</i></p>	<p align="center">10% Vacant 20% Underutilized</p> <p><i>A comparison of unavailable land deductions and market factors region-wide showed Kitsap County's was amongst the lowest in the region (25% for both vacant and underutilized is common). With the housing market in a substantial flux and projections of the 2006 land capacity analysis out of date, a revision to land not expected to develop by 2025 may be prudent. These shifting boom and bust market conditions may have an impact of the willingness of owners with underutilized land (land developed but not to the density of urban zone) to sell their land for redevelopment or redevelop it themselves by 2025. Additional analysis will be conducted in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to determine appropriate market factor reductions.</i></p>	<p align="center">5% Vacant land 15% Underutilized</p> <p><i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology.</i></p>

DENSITY TRENDS AND LAND CAPACITY ASSUMPTIONS (ALTERNATIVES 1-4)

FEATURE	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4 (NO ACTION)
Underutilized Land: Lots within Plats	<i>Remove underutilized lots from developed plats. The development of these lots is often substantially impeded if not functionally-prohibited by plat requirements or covenants. An example of these impediments includes strict plat covenants and majority approval of landowners within a plat if additional lots are to be created.</i>	<i>Remove underutilized lots from developed plats. The development of these lots is often substantially impeded if not functionally-prohibited by plat requirements or covenants. An example of these impediments includes strict plat covenants and majority approval of landowners within a plat if additional lots are to be created.</i>	<i>Remove underutilized lots from developed plats. The development of these lots is often substantially impeded if not functionally-prohibited by plat requirements or covenants. An example of these impediments includes strict plat covenants and majority approval of landowners within a plat if additional lots are to be created.</i>	<i>Include underutilized lots from developed plats. Same assumptions used in 2006 land capacity methodology.</i>
Rights of Way Deduction	20% <i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology. Analysis of development patterns from 2000-2010 supports this assumption.</i>	20% <i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology. Analysis of development patterns from 2000-2010 supports this assumption.</i>	20% <i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology. Analysis of development patterns from 2000-2010 supports this assumption.</i>	20% <i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology. Analysis of development patterns from 2000-2010 supports this assumption.</i>
Public Facilities Deduction	15% <i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology</i>	17% <i>Analysis of plats developed during the 2000-2010 time period showed an increase in land dedicated to public facilities. This may be due to site limitations of available land or increasing development standards such as stormwater facilities and active open spaces located within developments.</i>	20% <i>Analysis of plats developed during the 2000-2010 time period showed an increase in land dedicated to public facilities. This may be due to site limitations of available land or increasing development standards such as stormwater facilities and active open spaces located within developments.</i>	15% <i>Consistent with existing 2006 land capacity methodology</i>
Critical Areas Deduction	Site-Specific <i>Based upon existing mapping of critical areas and their required buffers.</i>	Site-Specific <i>Based upon existing mapping of critical areas and their required buffers.</i>	Site-Specific <i>Based upon existing mapping of critical areas and their required buffers.</i>	Site-Specific <i>Based upon existing mapping of critical areas and their required buffers.</i>

ALTERNATIVE COMPARISON MATRICES

Below are comparison matrices for the four preliminary alternatives proposed for each UGA. This is intended to be a basic qualitative analysis of the alternative boundaries, areas removed and the general urban infrastructure and environmental impacts of each. Further analysis will be conducted in the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement.

KINGSTON UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	This alternative removes Urban Restricted lands along Jefferson Point and Washington Avenue. Also, northwestern and southeastern portions of the Arborwood development have been removed. While these portions of the Arborwood development are excluded from the UGA, they are vested at urban densities and allowed to develop as approved within a set time period. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 1,278 acres in size, a 22% gross area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	This alternative removes the majority of Urban Restricted lands located within the UGA. These lands are along Jefferson Point, Washington Avenue and north of West Kingston Road. Arborwood, in its entirety, is included in the UGA. Additionally, some Urban Medium lands located off of Lindvog Road have been removed. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 1,137 acres in size, a 31% gross area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	Alternative 3 removes many Urban Restricted lands, largely located along Jefferson Point, West Kingston Road, as well as the lands located on Washington Avenue. Arborwood is largely included except a portion south of Norman Road. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 1,215 acres in size, a 26% gross area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. This Alternative is approximately 1,646 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	Proposed lands to be removed contain a majority of the vacant lands within the alternative boundary.	A large percentage of vacant lands are proposed to remain in the UGA, specifically the preliminary vested development of Arborwood.	The proposed lands to be excluded from the UGA include a significant percentage of the vacant land totals.	Majority of vacant lands are located on the fringes of the UGA boundary.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed Alternative. Majority of these lands are located along South Kingston Road and north along Barber Cut Off Road.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative. Majority of these lands are located along South Kingston Road and north along Barber Cut Off Road.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative. Majority of these lands are located along South Kingston Road and north along Barber Cut Off Road.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative. Majority of these lands are located along South Kingston Road and north along Barber Cut Off Road.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This Alternative may be slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative is oversized and far exceeds its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains 2 vested preliminary plats. Portions of the vested Arborwood plat are located within the alternative boundary.	This Alternative contains 2 vested preliminary plats. The entirety of the vested Arborwood plat is located within the alternative boundary.	This Alternative contains 2 vested preliminary plats. A majority of the vested Arborwood plat is located within the alternative boundary.	This Alternative contains 2 preliminary vested plats. Arborwood is included in its entirety.
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 655 acres of critical areas or 51% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 552 acres of critical areas or 49% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 57% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 863 acres of critical areas or 52% of the total acreage within the Alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy, High Intensity and Shoreline Residential.
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	Stormwater facilities are commonly found within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and dependant on age of development.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID)	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, the UGA includes a number of areas that show characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This Alternative requires a total of 5 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 2 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 5 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 8 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.
New Sewer Main Lines Needs	This Alternative requires a total of 27,944 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 24,156 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 26,225 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 36,013 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on West Kingston Road and South Kingston Road.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on West Kingston Road and South Kingston Road.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on West Kingston Road and South Kingston Road.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on West Kingston Road and South Kingston Road.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA contains a number of community parks and schools with open space.

SILVERDALE UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	This alternative proposes to remove lands north and west of Silverdale Way, the Schold Farm Wetland Mitigation Bank, residential lands located south of Westgate Road and along Anderson Hill Road. Additionally lands are removed south of Newberry Hill Road and west of the Eldorado Hills neighborhood. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 5,992 acres in size, a 21% area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	This alternative proposes to remove lands north and west of Silverdale Way, the Schold Farm Wetland Mitigation Bank, residential lands located south of Westgate Road and along Anderson Hill Road. Alternative 2 removes only the southern portion of vacant lands located south of Newberry Hill Road and west of the Eldorado Hills neighborhood. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 6,426 acres in size, a 16% area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	Alternative 3 retains majority of 2006 UGA boundaries, however excludes of lands south of Newberry Hill Road, the Eldorado Hills neighborhood and properties along Chico Way. Except for lands around the Island Lake area, this alternative is most similar to the proposed City of Silverdale boundaries. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 6,247 acres in size, an 18% area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. Land Capacity Assumptions used are consistent with the 2007 Buildable Lands Reports. This Alternative is approximately 7,618 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	Majority of the vacant lands located south of Newberry Hill Road and west of Chico Way as well as the Eldorado Hills neighborhood are proposed to be excluded from the UGA.	A portion of the vacant lands located south of Newberry Hill Road and west of Chico Way as well as the Eldorado Hills neighborhood are proposed to be excluded from the UGA.	Majority of the vacant lands located south of Newberry Hill Road and west of Chico Way as well as the Eldorado Hills neighborhood are proposed to be excluded from the UGA.	Vacant lands are located sporadically throughout the UGA boundary, but significant portions are located south of Newberry Hill Road and west of Chico Way and the Eldorado Hills neighborhood.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	Lands removed from the UGA, specifically along north and west of Silverdale Way, south of Westgate Road and along Anderson Hill Road contain most of the underutilized capacity.	Lands removed from the UGA, specifically along north and west of Silverdale Way, south of Westgate Road and along Anderson Hill Road contain most of the underutilized capacity.	In Alternative 3, majority of the underutilized capacity remains in the proposed UGA boundary.	A majority of underutilized lands are located along north and west of Silverdale Way, south of Westgate Road and along Anderson Hill Road.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative may be oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative may be slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative is oversized and far exceeds its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains 7 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains 7 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains 8 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains 9 preliminary vested plats.
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 1,774 acres of critical areas or 30% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 1,884 acres of critical areas or 29% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 11% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 2,459 acres of critical areas or 32% of the total acreage within the Alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Urban Conservancy, High Intensity and Shoreline Residential.	Urban Conservancy, High Intensity and Shoreline Residential.	Urban Conservancy, High Intensity and Shoreline Residential.	Urban Conservancy, High Intensity and Shoreline Residential.
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	Stormwater facilities are commonly within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and dependant on age of development.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID)	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, the UGA includes a number of areas that show characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This Alternative requires a total of 41 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 47 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 45 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 55 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.
New Sewer Main Lines Needs	This Alternative requires a total of 145,886 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 170,715 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 165,391 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 216,965 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Ridgetop Blvd, Old Frontier Road, Provost Road, a portion of Bucklin Hill Road near Tracyton Blvd and a portion of Chico Way.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Ridgetop Blvd, Old Frontier Road, Provost Road, a portion of Bucklin Hill Road near Tracyton Blvd and a portion of Chico Way.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Ridgetop Blvd, Old Frontier Road, Provost Road, a portion of Bucklin Hill Road near Tracyton Blvd and a portion of Chico Way.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Ridgetop Blvd, Old Frontier Road, Provost Road, a portion of Bucklin Hill Road near Tracyton Blvd and a portion of Chico Way.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	The proposed alternative does remove the Schold Farm wetland mitigation bank and portion of the Clear Creek trail system out of the UGA. This trail system and mitigation bank does serve a regional purpose. School properties that include open space amenities are still included in the UGA.	The proposed alternative does remove the Schold Farm wetland mitigation bank and portion of the Clear Creek trail system out of the UGA. This trail system and mitigation bank does serve a regional purpose.	No regional parks or school properties which include open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA boundary includes a mixture of community and regional parks, as well as a number of schools that provide open space opportunities.

CENTRAL KITSAP UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	Alternative 1 proposes to remove lands from the Gilberton and University Point areas, as well as lands stretching south from Windy Point down to Tracyton to Riddell Road. Additionally, a portion of the Illahee community is proposed to be excluded. This alternative is approximately 4,420 acres in size, a 29% area reduction compared to Alternative 4. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan.	Alternative 2 proposes to retract the Gilberton and University Point areas, as well some lands near John Carlson Road from the UGA. This Alternative is approximately 5,701 acres in size, an 11% area reduction compared to Alternative 4. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan.	Alternative 3 proposes to exclude the Gilberton and University Point areas, as well some lands stretching south from Windy Point down to Tracyton along Riddell Road. This Alternative is approximately 5,477 acres in size, a 15% area reduction compared to Alternative 4. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan.	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. The Land Capacity Assumptions used are consistent with the 2007 Buildable Lands Reports. This Alternative is approximately 6,602 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	Alternative 1 excludes most of all existing vacant lands.	Alternative 2 proposes to exclude the majority of vacant lands located in the Brownsville and Gilberton areas.	Alternative 3 removes a significant portion of vacant lands located in the Brownsville, Gilberton and Windy Point areas, as well as north to Windy Point down to Tracyton along Riddell Road.	Majority of vacant lands are located in the Brownsville, Gilberton and Windy Point areas. Other vacant lands are located sporadically throughout the UGA.
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	Alternative 1 removes the majority of underutilized lands located east of Windy Point and north along John Carlson Road.	A significant portion of underutilized lands found along John Carlson Road is proposed to be excluded from the UGA boundary.	A significant portion of the underutilized lands commonly found east of Windy Point and John Carlson Road are included in the proposed alternative.	Underutilized lands are largely found north along John Carlson Road and east of Windy Point.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This Alternative maybe slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative maybe slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative maybe slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative is oversized and far exceeds its CPP-directed population target.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains 1 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains 5 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains 6 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains 6 preliminary vested plats.
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 1,339 acres of critical areas or 30% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 708 acres of critical areas or 12% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 13% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 2,519 acres of critical areas or 38% of the total acreage within the alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential.	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential.	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential.	Urban Conservancy, Shoreline Residential, Natural and Rural Conservancy.
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	Stormwater facilities are commonly within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and dependant on age of development.
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, the UGA includes a number of areas that show characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This Alternative requires a total of 8 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 20 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 13 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 27 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
New Sewer Main Lines Needs	This Alternative requires a total of 81,997 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 134,142 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 115,245 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 159,876 linear feet of new sewer mainlines to fully service the UGA.
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur for a portion of Riddell Road toward Almira Drive.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur for a portion of Riddell Road toward Almira Drive.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur for a portion of Riddell Road toward Almira Drive.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur for a portion of Riddell Road toward Almira Drive.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	In this alternative, the Illahee State Park is proposed to be removed from the UGA. All other regional facilities remain in the UGA.	No regional parks or school properties which include open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA boundary includes a mixture of community and regional parks, as well as a number of schools that provide open space opportunities. These amenities include, but not limited to the Illahee Preserve and Fairgrounds complex.

EAST BREMERTON UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	Alternative 1 proposes to retract portions of the UGA south of Riddell Road towards Port Washington Narrows, as well as lands south of Sylvan Way east towards Port Orchard Bay. This Alternative is approximately 604 acres in size, a 50% area reduction compared to Alternative 4. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan.	No land is removed from this alternative due to excess population demand in this UGA. This Alternative is approximately 1,200 acres in size, a 0% area reduction compared to Alternative 4. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan.	No land is removed from this alternative due to excess population demand in this UGA. This Alternative is approximately 1,200 acres in size, a 0% area reduction compared to Alternative 4. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan.	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. The Land Capacity Assumptions used are consistent with the 2007 Buildable Lands Report. This Alternative is approximately 1,200 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	Significant portions of vacant lands located south of Riddell Road towards Port Washington Narrows are proposed to be excluded.	Retains all vacant lands in the proposed alternative.	Retains all vacant lands in the proposed alternative.	As this UGA is largely developed, vacant lands are located sporadically throughout the UGA boundary.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	Significant portions of underutilized lands located south of Riddell Road towards Port Washington Narrows, as well as some lands south of Sylvan Way east towards Port Orchard Bay are proposed to be excluded.	Retains all underutilized lands in the proposed alternative.	Retains all underutilized lands in the proposed alternative.	As this UGA is largely developed, underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the UGA boundary.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This alternative maybe significantly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative maybe slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative maybe slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative is undersized and does not meet its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains no preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains no preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains no preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains no preliminary vested plats.
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 318 acres of critical areas or 53% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 58% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 58% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 58% of the total acreage within the Alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Shoreline Residential	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	Stormwater facilities are commonly within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and dependant on age of development.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Alternative 2 retains the existing UGA boundary which does include moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Alternative 3 retains the existing UGA boundary which does include moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, the UGA includes a number of areas that show characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
New Sewer Pipe Needs	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	May reduce impacts to Riddell Road, Tracyton Beach Road and Trenton Avenue.	Transportation impacts may occur to Riddell Road, Trenton and Perry Avenues.	Transportation impacts may occur to Riddell Road, Trenton and Perry Avenues.	Transportation impacts may occur to Riddell Road, Trenton and Perry Avenues.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	Alternative 1 does not exclude any regional parks or school properties.	No regional parks or school properties which include open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA boundary does not include any regional or school facilities. Small neighborhood or community parks are present in limited numbers, primarily located within subdivisions.

WEST BREMERTON UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	This alternative removes Urban Low and Urban Medium lands along State Highway 3 down to Sand Dollar Road and the area of Rocky Point north of Shaw Island Way. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 686 acres in size, a 43% gross area reduction compared to Alternative 4 (2006 boundary).	No land is removed from this alternative due to excess population demand in this UGA. Zoning is consistent with the current 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 1,196 acres in size, no reduction compared to Alternative 4 (2006 boundary).	No land is removed from this alternative due to excess population demand in this UGA. This Alternative is approximately 1,196 acres in size, no reduction compared to Alternative 4 (2006 boundary).	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. Assumptions used are consistent with the 2007 Buildable Lands Report. This Alternative is approximately 1,196 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	Proposed lands to be removed from the UGA contain a majority of the vacant lands within the UGA.	No land was removed from the UGA in this alternative; thus no vacant land was affected.	No land was removed from the UGA in this alternative; thus no vacant land was affected.	Majority of vacant lands are located on the edges of the UGA boundary.
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	Underutilized lands make up the majority of the remaining capacity in this alternative.	No land was removed from the UGA in this alternative; thus no underutilized land was affected.	No land was removed from the UGA in this alternative; thus no underutilized land was affected.	No land was removed from the UGA in this alternative; thus no underutilized land was affected.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This Alternative may be greatly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be moderately undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative is moderately undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 225 acres of critical areas or 33% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 325 acres of critical areas or 27% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 325 acres of critical areas or 27% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 325 acres of critical areas or 27% of the total acreage within the alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Urban Conservancy, Shoreline Residential and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy, Shoreline Residential and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy, Shoreline Residential and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy, Shoreline Residential and High Intensity.
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	Stormwater facilities are commonly found within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and dependant on age of development.
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, the UGA includes a number of areas that show characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This Alternative requires a total of 1 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 2 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 5 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 8 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.
New Sewer Main Lines Needs	This Alternative requires a total of 19,855 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 48,234 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 48,234 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 48,234 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Reduced impacts on Rocky Point Road and Sherman Heights Road may occur.	No additional transportation impacts.	No additional transportation impacts.	Transportation impacts may occur on National Avenue and Sherman Heights and Rocky Point Roads.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA contains a limited number of parks and two school sites with open space amenities.

GORST UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	This alternative removes 4 acres of residential land located off Quarry Street. Zoning for the remaining UGA remains consistent with the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 331 acres in size, a 1% gross area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	This alternative removes 4 acres of residential land located off Quarry Street. Zoning for the remaining UGA remains consistent with the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 331 acres in size; a 1% gross area reduction compared to Alternative 4.	No land is removed from the UGA Alternative 4 (2006 UGA) boundary. Zoning for the remaining UGA remains consistent with the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This Alternative is approximately 335 acres in size; no reduction from Alternative 4.	The Gorst UGA is predominantly commercially and industrially zoned. Limited residential opportunities exist within the 2006 boundary. Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. This Alternative is approximately 335 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	Areas to be removed by this alternative do not affect the vacant land supply of the UGA.	Areas to be removed by this alternative do not affect the vacant land supply of the UGA.	No land is removed in this alternative, thus no vacant land is impacted.	The Gorst UGA contains little residential land. Of that limited residential land, little is vacant

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	This alternative removes limited acres of underutilized land from the Quarry Street area.	This alternative removes limited acres of underutilized land from the Quarry Street area.	No land is removed in this alternative, thus no underutilized land is impacted.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.	This Alternative contains no vested preliminary plats.
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 216 acres of critical areas or 65% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 216 acres of critical areas or 65% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 218 acres of critical areas or 65% of the total acreage within the Alternative.	Contains 218 acres of critical areas or 65% of the total acreage within the Alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.	Urban Conservancy and High Intensity.
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No area is removed from the UGA in this alternative.	Stormwater facilities are commonly found within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and dependant on age of development.
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics generally indicate unlikelihood for LID success.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics generally indicate unlikelihood for LID success.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics generally indicate unlikelihood for LID success.	Generally, the UGA includes areas that show characteristics of poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics generally indicate poor likelihood of LID success. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This alternative requires no new pump stations to fully serve the UGA. The City of Bremerton recently constructed the two pump station necessary to serve the UGA.	This alternative requires no new pump stations to fully serve the UGA. The City of Bremerton recently constructed the two pump station necessary to serve the UGA.	This alternative requires no new pump stations to fully serve the UGA. The City of Bremerton recently constructed the two pump station necessary to serve the UGA.	This alternative requires no new pump stations to fully serve the UGA. The City of Bremerton recently constructed the two pump station necessary to serve the UGA.
New Sewer Main Lines Needs	This alternative requires no new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA. The City of Bremerton installed main lines throughout the UGA boundary.	This alternative requires no new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA. The City of Bremerton installed main lines throughout the UGA boundary.	This alternative requires no new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA. The City of Bremerton installed main lines throughout the UGA boundary.	This Alternative requires no new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA. The City of Bremerton installed main lines throughout the UGA boundary.
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Transportation impacts may be limited to existing issues on State Highway 3 and 16.	Transportation impacts may be limited to existing issues on State Highway 3 and 16.	Transportation impacts may be limited to existing issues on State Highway 3 and 16.	Transportation impacts may be limited to existing issues on State Highway 3 and 16.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA includes the Sinclair Inlet/Gorst Viewing area and shoreline restoration project.

MCCORMICK/ULID NO. 6 UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	This alternative removed Urban Cluster land encumbered by the McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan. The alternative is 1,755 acres in size; a 26.3% reduction . The remainder of this UGA has been annexed by the City of Port Orchard.	This alternative retains the Urban Cluster land encumbered by the McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan. This alternative is approximately 2,381 acres in size. The remaining portion of the UGA is annexed by the City of Port Orchard.	This alternative retains the Urban Cluster land encumbered by the McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan. This alternative is approximately 2,381 acres in size. The remaining portion of the UGA is annexed by the City of Port Orchard.	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. No annexations are reflected in this alternative. This alternative is approximately 2,381 acres in size.
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	This alternative proposes to remove the vacant, yet vested, McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan.	Alternative 2 includes the vacant and vested McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan.	This Alternative includes the vacant and vested McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan.	This Alternative includes the vacant and vested McCormick West Preliminary Plat and Master Plan.
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	There are no underutilized lands located within the proposed UGA.	There are no underutilized lands located within the proposed UGA.	There are no underutilized lands located within the proposed UGA.	There are no underutilized lands located within the proposed UGA.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This Alternative generally meets the CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative is oversized and far exceeds its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains 0 preliminary vested plats. This alternative reflects the recent annexations by the City of Port Orchard.	This Alternative contains 1 preliminary vested plat. This alternative reflects the recent annexations by the City of Port Orchard.	This Alternative contains 1 preliminary vested plat. This alternative reflects the recent annexations by the City of Port Orchard.	This Alternative contains 1 preliminary vested plat. As the no action alternative, this alternative uses 2006 as its base and is prior to the annexation by the City of Port Orchard.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 0 acres . The proposed alternative removes all remaining critical areas from the boundary except those annexed by the City of Port Orchard.	Contains 121 acres of critical areas or 19% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 121 acres of critical areas or 19% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 205 acres of critical areas or 9% of the total acreage within the alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	No shorelines are in this boundary.	No shorelines are in this boundary.	No shorelines are in this boundary.	No shorelines are in this boundary.
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	Regional stormwater facilities that serve the McCormick West plat and Master Plan are currently already located outside the UGA. Remaining stormwater facilities are located in the annexation area and under the ownership of the City of Port Orchard.	Regional stormwater facilities that serve the McCormick West plat and Master Plan are currently already located outside the UGA. Remaining stormwater facilities are located in the annexation area and under the ownership of the City of Port Orchard.	Regional stormwater facilities that serve the McCormick West plat and Master Plan are currently already located outside the UGA. Remaining stormwater facilities are located in the annexation area and under the ownership of the City of Port Orchard.	Regional stormwater facilities that serve the McCormick West plat and Master Plan are currently already located outside the UGA. Remaining stormwater facilities that serve the McCormick Woods and The Ridge developments are located in the alternative.
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques	Generally, this UGA shows the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils and critical areas. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, this UGA shows the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils and critical areas. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, this UGA shows the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils and critical areas. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.	Generally, this UGA shows the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils and critical areas. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This Alternative requires a total of 0 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 2 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 2 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 2 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.
New Sewer Main Lines Needs	This Alternative requires a total of 0 linear feet of new sewer lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 7,614 linear feet of new sewer lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 7,614 linear feet of new sewer lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 7,614 linear feet of new sewer lines to fully service the UGA.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Old Clifton Road, Lake Flora Road and Berry Lake Road.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Old Clifton Road, Lake Flora Road and Berry Lake Road.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Old Clifton Road, Lake Flora Road and Berry Lake Road.	Transportation impacts and need for capacity improvements may occur on Old Clifton Road, Lake Flora Road and Berry Lake Road.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are removed from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are removed from the UGA alternative.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are removed from the UGA alternative.	The UGA contains a number of community and private parks and other open space areas.

PORT ORCHARD/SOUTH KITSAP UGA				
EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
UGA Boundary and Zoning Description	This alternative removes the following areas from the 2006 UGA boundary: land northeast of Collins Road; the stretch of property east of Phillips Road including the finger that extends to Long Lake Park; and all areas south of Cedar Road and Donato Lane. Zoning for the remaining UGA remains consistent with the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This alternative is approximately 4,228 acres in size; a 30% reduction from Alternative 4.	This alternative removes the following areas from the 2006 UGA boundary: land northeast of Collins Road, east of Lidstrom Road and north of Mile Hill Drive; the stretch of property east of Phillips Road including the finger that extends to Long Lake Park; and all areas south of Bielmeier Road. Zoning for the remaining UGA remains consistent with the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This alternative is approximately 4,621 acres in size; a 23% reduction from Alternative 4.	This alternative removes the following areas from the 2006 UGA boundary: land northeast of Collins Road; the properties south of Beilmeier Road; and areas south of Cedar Road except for most of those west North Van De Car Road. Zoning for the remaining UGA remains consistent with the 2011 Comprehensive Plan. This alternative is approximately 4,867 acres in size; a 19.3% reduction from Alternative 4.	Boundaries and zoning consistent with the 2006 Comprehensive Plan adoption. This Alternative is approximately 6,023 acres in size.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
LAND USE				
Vacant Land	A majority of the UGAs vacant land is included in the areas removed from the UGA.	Some vacant lands are located in the areas northeast of Collins Road and south of Beilmeier Road proposed for removal from the UGA.	Some vacant lands are located in the areas northeast of Collins Road and south of Cedar Road proposed for removal from the UGA.	Majority of vacant lands are located on the fringes of the UGA boundary.
Underutilized/infill Opportunities	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed Alternative. Many of these lands are predominantly located south of Sedgwick Road and north of Mile Hill Drive.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative. Many of these lands are predominantly located south of Sedgwick Road and north of Mile Hill Drive.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative. Many of these lands are predominantly located south of Sedgwick Road and north of Mile Hill Drive.	Underutilized lands are located sporadically throughout the proposed alternative. Many of these lands are predominantly located south of Sedgwick Road and north of Mile Hill Drive.
Land Capacity Versus Meeting Demand?	This Alternative may be slightly oversized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be slightly undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative may be moderately undersized compared to its CPP-directed population target.	This Alternative is oversized and far exceeds its CPP-directed population target.
ANNEXATION/VESTED PLATS				
Acknowledgement of Vested Plats and Annexations	This Alternative contains 10 preliminary vested plats. Two are omitted from the alternative boundary.	This Alternative contains all 12 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains all 12 preliminary vested plats.	This Alternative contains all 12 preliminary vested plats.
CRITICAL AREAS/ENVIRONMENTAL				
% Critical Areas	Contains 1,266 acres of critical areas or 30% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 1,368 acres of critical areas or 30% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 698 acres of critical areas or 14% of the total acreage within the alternative.	Contains 1,909 acres of critical areas or 32% of the total acreage within the alternative.
Shorelines Designations Included	Very few shoreline properties. Shoreline Residential	Very few shoreline properties. Shoreline Residential	Very few shoreline properties. Shoreline Residential	Urban Conservancy and Shoreline Residential.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
STORMWATER				
Existing Drainage Conveyance Infrastructure	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	No significant or regional stormwater facilities are removed from the UGA.	Stormwater facilities are commonly found within existing development. Age and size of system, as well as standards used vary and are dependant on age of development.
Soils for Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils and some critical areas. The area northeast of Collins Road is particularly poor. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. A site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils and some critical areas. The area northeast of Collins Road is particularly poor. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. A site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.	Areas proposed to be removed generally show the characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils. The area northeast of Collins Road is particularly poor. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. A site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.	Generally, the UGA includes a number of areas that show characteristics of moderate to poor draining soils, critical areas and steep slopes. These basic characteristics may affect success of LID in various areas of the alternative. However, a site-specific determination would be evaluated at the time of project submittal.
WASTEWATER				
# New Pump Stations Removed Compared to Alternative 4	This Alternative requires a total of 8 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 9 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 12 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 20 new pump stations to fully serve the UGA.
New Sewer Main Line Needs	This Alternative requires a total of 44,479 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 47,999 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 59,284 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.	This Alternative requires a total of 74,550 linear feet of new sewer main lines to fully service the UGA.

EVALUATION CRITERIA	ALTERNATIVE 1	ALTERNATIVE 2	ALTERNATIVE 3	ALTERNATIVE 4
TRANSPORTATION				
Arterial or Collector Impacts	Transportation impacts should be lessened on Beach Drive and Beilmeier and Phillips Roads. Additional impacts could be found on Bethel, Lund, Salmonberry and Sedgwick Roads as well as Jackson Avenue.	Transportation impacts should be lessened on Beach Drive and Beilmeier, Horstman, Lidstrom and Phillips Roads. Additional impacts could be found on Bethel, Lund, Salmonberry and Sedgwick Roads as well as Jackson Avenue.	Transportation impacts should be lessened on Beach Drive and Beilmeier Roads. Additional impacts could be found on Bethel, Lund, Salmonberry and Sedgwick Roads as well as Jackson Avenue.	Transportation impacts capacity improvements may be needed on Bethel Road, Jackson Avenue and Mile Hill Drive.
PARKS				
Park/Open Space	Long Lake Community Park is removed from the UGA in the alternative boundary.	Long Lake Community Park is removed from the UGA in the alternative boundary.	No regional parks or school properties which include park/open space amenities are excluded from the UGA alternative.	The UGA contains a number of community parks and schools with open space.