



KITSAP COUNTY UGA SIZING & COMPOSITION REMAND

# Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

AUGUST 2012





# Kitsap County UGA Sizing and Composition Remand

## Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

August 2012





## KITSAP COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

614 DIVISION STREET MS-36, PORT ORCHARD WASHINGTON 98366-4682 Larry Keeton, Director  
(360) 337-5777 FAX (360) 337-4415 HOME PAGE - [www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/](http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/)

---

August 10, 2012

Subject: Kitsap County Urban Growth Area Sizing and Composition Remand  
Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

Dear Reader:

This Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS) completes the analysis of the Proposed Action consisting of amendments to Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan approved by the County in 2006. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are the result of a remand by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board requiring the County to revisit its urban growth areas (UGAs) to ensure that the County's residential land capacity assumptions reflect local conditions and Growth Management Act (GMA) goals for future growth. As a result of reviewing UGA residential capacities and sizing, the County is also proposing consistency amendments with its adopted Comprehensive Plan Elements, including land use, capital facilities, and others.

The Final SEIS studies a Preferred Alternative in the range of the Draft SEIS alternatives, which included No Action, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2. The No Action Alternative is required by SEPA and is the continuation of the current Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2006. The Preferred Alternative as well as Alternatives 1 and 2 review different UGA capacities and boundaries in eight UGAs including: Kingston, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, Gorst, Port Orchard and ULID6/McCormick Woods. The Preferred Alternative resolves major issues including:

- The selection of land capacity adjustments reflecting trends: With the Preferred Alternative assumed densities are the same as for Alternative 2. Discount factors in the land capacity method are changed to reflect recent trends, except that the existing unavailable land factor would be retained rather than increased.
- The reduction in UGA boundaries including location and extent: The Preferred Alternative provides UGA boundary modifications similar to but smaller than Alternative 2.
- The provision of public services and utilities to alternative UGA boundaries, including altered level of service standards: Similar to Alternatives 1 and 2, the Preferred Alternative includes an updated Capital Facility Plan that incorporates levels of service matching planned infrastructure investments while supporting the land use plan.
- The potential for banking population from UGAs that are undersized and reallocating to adjoining and associated cities or to UGAs that are oversized: Policies allowing population reallocation are retained with the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative is within 2% of the population growth target in the Countywide Planning Policies, the closest of the studied alternatives.

This SEIS supplements the prior EIS prepared for Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update in 2006: *Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update and Integrated Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statement, August and December 2006*, respectively. The prior 2006 Final EIS alternatives studied a broad range of UGA land use patterns, boundaries, and population capacities. Consistent with the SEPA Rules, this SEIS does not fully repeat the analysis of actions, alternatives, or impacts included in the 2006 Final EIS.

The Final SEIS responds to comments on the Draft SEIS, and provides clarifications and corrections as appropriate. The Final SEIS focuses on the impacts and mitigation of the Preferred Alternative. Readers are encouraged to read the Final SEIS in the context of the Draft SEIS which focuses on the No Action Alternative and Alternatives 1 and 2.

The Board of County Commissioners will also hold a public hearing on the Preferred Alternative Comprehensive Plan Amendments as follows:

Date and Time: August 27, 2012, 5:30 p.m.

Location: Kitsap County Board of Commissioner's Chambers at 619 Division Street Port Orchard, WA 98366

For additional background information, please see the project website: <http://www.kitsapgov.com>. For questions, please contact Angie Silva, Special Projects Planner/Policy Analyst at (360) 337-4841 or [asilva@co.kitsap.wa.us](mailto:asilva@co.kitsap.wa.us).

Sincerely,



Steve Heacock,

SEPA Responsible Official, Kitsap County Community Development Environmental Planner

## Fact Sheet

### Project Title

Kitsap County Urban Growth Area (UGA) Sizing and Composition Remand

### Proposed Action and Alternatives

The Proposed Action consists of amendments to Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan approved by the County in 2006 consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA) 10-year update review cycle. The proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are the result of a remand by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (CPSGMHB) requiring the County to revisit its UGAs to ensure that the County's residential land capacity assumptions reflect local conditions and GMA goals for future growth. As a result of reviewing UGA residential capacities and sizing, the County is also proposing consistency amendments with its adopted Comprehensive Plan Elements, including land use, capital facilities, and others.

The Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) addresses four alternatives: No Action, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and the Preferred Alternative. The No Action Alternative is required by SEPA and is the continuation of the current Comprehensive Plan adopted in 2006. Alternatives 1 and 2 and the Preferred Alternative review different UGA capacities and boundaries.

- **No Action Alternative.** This alternative retains the current Comprehensive Plan, UGA boundaries, and associated land use. Some trend assumptions for single-family densities, based upon 2005 development patterns, would be incorporated into the County's land capacity method. With the greater territory and increased density assumptions, this alternative provides for the largest UGA boundaries and the greatest capacity for growth.
- **Alternative 1.** This alternative modifies the UGA boundaries and associated land use the most dramatically. Alternative 1 reduces UGA boundaries the greatest amount in all studied UGAs. The basis for the reductions is more optimistic long-term development assumptions about future residential densities and a compact urban form.
- **Alternative 2.** This alternative provides for intermediate UGA boundary modifications and some changes to land capacity assumptions based on local circumstances and projected future development patterns to 2025. Assumed densities are greater than the No Action Alternative but less than Alternative 1. Discount factors in the land capacity method are changed to reflect recent trends. With moderate density and discount factor changes, UGA boundary reductions are more moderate as a result.
- **Preferred Alternative.** The Preferred Alternative provides UGA boundary modifications similar to but smaller than Alternative 2 and provides changes to land capacity assumptions similar to Alternative 2. Assumed densities are the same as for Alternative 2. Discount factors in the land capacity method are changed to reflect recent trends, except that the existing unavailable land factor would be retained rather than increased. On the whole, the Preferred Alternative has a projected population similar to Alternative 2 and the Countywide Planning Policies but located in more compact boundaries in the range of Alternatives 1 and 2.

Implementing policies and regulations are addressed for some aspects of the Preferred Alternative, as well as Alternatives 1 and 2.

- **Land Capacity Method.** All alternatives consider land capacity assumptions and propose changes based on local circumstances observed from 2000-2010. Primarily, the achieved densities found in unincorporated residential zones are considered. Alternative 2 and the

Preferred Alternative consider modifications to discount factors such as public facilities based on observed trends. Alternative 2 also considers changes to unavailable lands factors.

- **Land Use and Zoning Map.** The following revisions to the Land Use and Zoning Maps governing future land uses are proposed.
  - Eight UGAs are considered for boundary changes in Alternatives 1 and 2 and the Preferred Alternative to accommodate population growth targets based on a new land capacity method that recognizes local circumstances. All studied UGAs would be amended with Alternative 1. Alternative 2 requires fewer boundary changes than Alternative 1. Due to the evaluation of land supply and demand not all UGAs require reduction in territory under the Preferred Alternative. Specifically, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, and Gorst boundaries would not require reduction. Kingston, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and Port Orchard would be reduced. McCormick Woods/ULID6 would be slightly increased but only to include utility lands that provide service only to the adjacent UGA and have no development capacity.
  - UGA changes and land use and zoning redesignations are proposed in Alternatives 1 and 2 and the Preferred Alternative. These changes would remove territory from the current UGAs and redesignate them with appropriate rural classifications in place of urban classifications. All eight study UGAs would be affected. Alternative 1 would completely remove the Illahee area from the UGA. Alternative 2 would add some UGA territory to the Silverdale and Central Kitsap UGAs while also removing other territory. The Preferred Alternative would add UGA territory to the Central Kitsap UGA north of SR 303 while reducing territory elsewhere.
- **Plan policies.** Alternatives 1 and 2 and the Preferred Alternative propose amendments to the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan based on the revised Land Use Map and for purposes of maintaining internal consistency. Policies regarding UGAs and population would be amended. Further policies regarding capital facilities would be changed based on the balance of land use growth, needed improvements, and funding. A new Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) is proposed for Alternatives 1 and 2 and the Preferred Alternative.
- **Implementing regulations.** Development regulations, such as zoning, implement the Comprehensive Plan. Alternative 1 would remove the Illahee Greenbelt Zone as the area would become rural. In Alternative 2, the County is considering interim wastewater systems for final plats and proposing amendments to Title 17, footnote 48 which requires all new subdivisions to hook-up to sewer service. In the Preferred Alternative, the County is considering amendments to Title 17 that would require sewer connection when in proximity to a sewer line to be consistent with County health and sewer codes (e.g. Title 13). Additional amendments to Title 17 Zoning are to ensure consistency with the proposed land use alternative. It is also anticipated that amendments to Kitsap County Code (KCC) 18.04.100 Categorical Exemptions for Infill Development would be needed if there are changes to the residential or infill capacity anticipated in the Silverdale Mixed Use Infill Trip Bank.

## Location

The Proposed Action primarily addresses the following UGAs: Kingston, Silverdale, Central Kitsap, East Bremerton, West Bremerton, Gorst, McCormick Woods/ULID#6, and Port Orchard/South Kitsap. While the focus of the evaluation is on the eight UGAs, the analysis is accomplished in the context of the cumulative growth planned for all incorporated cities, unincorporated UGAs, and rural lands.



## Environmental Document Supplemented

Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update – Integrated Plan and Environmental Impact Statement, Volume II: Final EIS, December 2006. The Kitsap County 10-Year Comprehensive Plan Update Draft and Final EISs are herein incorporated by reference.

## Proponent

Kitsap County

## Lead Agency

Kitsap County  
Department of Community Development  
614 Division Street, MS-36  
Port Orchard, WA 98366

## Responsible SEPA Official

Steve Heacock  
Environmental Planner, Community Development  
Community Development Department, MS-36  
614 Division Street  
Port Orchard, WA 98366

## Contact Person

Angie Silva  
Special Projects Planner/Policy Analyst  
614 Division St. MS-4  
Port Orchard, WA 98366  
Phone: (360) 337-4841  
Fax: (360) 337-4632  
Email: [asilva@co.kitsap.wa.us](mailto:asilva@co.kitsap.wa.us)

## Required Approvals

Adoption of the Comprehensive Plan Amendments and development regulations prepared in response to the Remand Order by the Kitsap Board of County Commissioners; review and comment by Washington State Department of Commerce as required by GMA; and Puget Sound Regional Council consultation and amendment review.

## Principal SEIS Authors and Principal Contributors

### *Principal Authors*

BERK  
2025 First Avenue, Suite 200  
Seattle, WA 98121  
Main (206) 324-8760  
(Project Management, Land and Shoreline Use; Relationship to Plans and Policies; Population, Housing and Employment; Public Buildings; Fire Protection; Law Enforcement; Parks and Recreation; Schools; Solid Waste; Energy and Telecommunications; Library; Trends Analysis – Appendix).

## Fact Sheet

### Parametrix

4660 Kitsap Way, Suite A

Bremerton, WA 98312

Main (360) 377-0014

(Water Resources; Plants and Animals; Transportation; Solid Waste; Wastewater; Stormwater; Water)

### *Contributing Authors*

Kitsap County Special Projects Division

(Alternatives; Public Outreach; GIS)

Kitsap County Public Works Department

(Traffic modeling)

### BHC

1601 Fifth Avenue Suite 500

Seattle, WA 98101

206.505.3400

(Sewer – County service area)

Mark Personius, AICP

Sole Proprietor

10223 62nd Avenue South

Seattle, WA 98178

Phone (206) 723-8793

(Trends Analysis – Appendix)

Andy Lane

Cairncross & Hempelmann

524 Second Ave., Ste. 500

Seattle, WA 98104-2323

(GMA and SEPA Compliance Consultation)

### Date of Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Issuance

May 7, 2012

### Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Review

A 30-day public comment period was held from May 7, 2012 to June 6, 2012. A public hearing was held on June 4, 2012 at 5:30 p.m. at the Kitsap County Board of Commissioner's Chambers located at 619 Division Street Port Orchard, WA 98366. Responses to written comments are provided in this Final SEIS.

### Date of Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Issuance

August 10, 2012

### Type and Timing of Subsequent Environmental Review

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

### Location of Background Data

Kitsap County Special Projects Division. See Contact Person above.

### Final SEIS Purchase Price

This Final SEIS is available for review at the Kitsap County Commissioners' Office 614 Division St, Port Orchard, WA 98366. The Final SEIS is posted on the County's website at [http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/community\\_plan/remand%202011/remand.htm](http://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/community_plan/remand%202011/remand.htm).

CDs are available for purchase at Kitsap County Commissioners' Office - see address above (cost at the time of this writing is \$6).



## Distribution List

The Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (Final SEIS) distribution list includes:

Federal, Tribal, State Regional Governments	Cities and Counties	Water and Sewer Districts	Port Districts
Naval Base Kitsap	City of Bainbridge Island	Cities' water and sewer utilities (see at left)	Port of Bremerton
Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribe	City of Bremerton	Crystal Springs Water District	Port of Brownsville
Puget Sound Clean Air Agency	City of Port Orchard	Kitsap Public Utility District (PUD)	Port of Elgon
Puget Sound Regional Council	City of Poulsbo	Manchester Water	Port of Illahee
Puget Sound Partnership	Jefferson County	North Perry Water	Port of Indianola
Suquamish Tribe	Mason County	Northwest Water Systems	Port of Kingston
Washington Department of Commerce, Growth Management Services	Pierce County	Old Bangor Water District	Port of Manchester
Washington Department of Corrections	<b>School Districts</b>	Rocky Point Water District	Port of Poulsbo
Washington Department of Ecology	Bainbridge Island School District	Silverdale Water District #16	Port of Silverdale
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Bremerton School District	Sunnyslope Water District	Port of Tracyton
Washington Department of Health	Central Kitsap School District	West Hills Water District	<b>Other</b>
Washington Department of Natural Resources	North Kitsap School District	Westsound Utility District	Bremerton Housing Authority
Washington Department of Social and Health Services	South Kitsap School District	<b>Libraries</b>	Housing Kitsap
Washington Department of Transportation	<b>Fire Districts</b>	Bainbridge Island Branch	Kitsap County Health District
Washington Recreation and Conservation Office	Bainbridge Island Fire Department	Bremerton Branch	Kitsap Economic Development Alliance
Washington Parks and Recreation Commission	Central Kitsap Fire and Rescue	Kingston Branch	Kitsap Historical Society
	North Kitsap Fire and Rescue	Kitsap Regional Library, Main Branch	Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council
	Poulsbo Fire Department/Fire District 18	Little Boston Branch	Olympic College
	South Kitsap Fire and Rescue	Manchester Branch	Power and Telecommunication Utilities
		Port Orchard Branch	South Kitsap Parks and Recreation District
		Poulsbo Branch	
		Silverdale Branch	

In addition, citizens and agencies providing comment as shown in Chapter 5 have been notified of this Final SEIS issuance. Other notification will be provided in accordance with Kitsap County Code Chapter 21.08.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter 1. Summary</b> .....	<b>1-1</b>
1.1. Purpose of Proposed Action .....	1-1
1.2. State Environmental Policy Act Process .....	1-3
1.3. Public Involvement.....	1-4
1.4. Proposed Action, Alternatives, and Objectives .....	1-5
1.4.1. Objectives .....	1-5
1.4.2. Proposed Action and Alternatives .....	1-5
1.5. Major Issues, Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty, and Issues to be Resolved.....	1-7
1.6. Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures .....	1-7
1.6.1. Impacts Common to All Alternatives .....	1-7
1.6.2. Matrix of Impacts by Alternative .....	1-13
1.6.3. Summary of Mitigation Measures.....	1-27
1.7. Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts.....	1-31
1.7.1. Natural Environment .....	1-31
1.7.2. Built Environment.....	1-31
1.7.3. Built Environment: Public Services and Utilities .....	1-32
 <b>Chapter 2. Alternatives</b> .....	 <b>2-1</b>
2.1. Introduction .....	2-1
2.2. Purpose of Remand .....	2-1
2.3. Description of the Plan Area .....	2-3
2.4. Purpose of this Final Supplemental EIS.....	2-3
2.5. SEPA Process .....	2-7
2.5.1. Public Review Opportunities .....	2-7
2.5.2. Prior Environmental Review.....	2-8
2.5.3. Level of Analysis .....	2-8
2.5.4. Phased Review .....	2-8
2.5.5. Future Use of Document.....	2-9
2.6. Development of Alternatives .....	2-9
2.6.1. Development of Alternatives .....	2-9
2.6.2. Proposal Objectives .....	2-13
2.6.3. Description of Alternatives .....	2-13
2.6.4. Alternatives and Vested Plats .....	2-35
2.6.5. Benefits and Disadvantages of Delaying the Proposed Action...	2-35

**Chapter 3. Affected Environment, Significant Impacts, and Mitigation Measures ..... 3-1**

- 3.1. NATURAL ENVIRONMENT ..... 3-1
  - 3.1.1. Water Resources (Surface and Ground)..... 3-1
  - 3.1.2. Plants and Animals ..... 3-4
- 3.2. Built Environment: Land Use and Transportation..... 3-5
  - 3.2.1. Land and Shoreline Use..... 3-5
  - 3.2.2. Relationship to Plans and Policies .....3-20
  - 3.2.3. Population, Housing and Employment .....3-32
  - 3.2.4. Transportation .....3-34
- 3.3. Built Environment: Public Services and Utilities .....3-41
  - 3.3.1. Public Buildings.....3-41
  - 3.3.2. Fire Protection.....3-42
  - 3.3.3. Law Enforcement .....3-43
  - 3.3.4. Parks and Recreation.....3-44
  - 3.3.5. Schools .....3-45
  - 3.3.6. Solid Waste .....3-45
  - 3.3.7. Wastewater .....3-46
  - 3.3.8. Stormwater.....3-46
  - 3.3.9. Water Supply.....3-57
  - 3.3.10. Energy and Telecommunications.....3-58
  - 3.3.11. Library.....3-58

**Chapter 4. Clarifications or Corrections to the Draft Supplemental EIS ..... 4-1**

- 4.1. Draft SEIS Chapter 1 Summary ..... 4-1
- 4.2. Draft SEIS Chapter 2 Alternatives..... 4-2
- 4.3. Draft SEIS Chapter 3 Affected Environment, Significant Impacts and Mitigation Measures ..... 4-5
  - 4.3.1. Water Resources ..... 4-5
  - 4.3.2. Plants and Animals ..... 4-5
  - 4.3.3. Land and Shoreline Use..... 4-5
  - 4.3.4. Relationship to Plans and Policies ..... 4-8
  - 4.3.5. Population, Employment and Housing ..... 4-9
  - 4.3.6. Transportation .....4-10
  - 4.3.7. Public Buildings.....4-19
  - 4.3.8. Fire Protection.....4-19
  - 4.3.9. Law Enforcement .....4-19



4.3.10. Parks and Recreation .....4-19

4.3.11. Schools.....4-19

4.3.12. Solid Waste .....4-19

4.3.13. Wastewater.....4-19

4.3.14. Stormwater .....4-19

4.3.15. Water Supply .....4-23

4.3.16. Energy and Telecommunications.....4-23

4.3.17. Library.....4-23

4.4. General Map Revisions – ULID6.....4-23

**Chapter 5. Responses to Comments .....5-1**

5.1. Public Comments..... 5-1

5.2. Responses to Comments..... 5-3

5.3. Public Hearing Testimony .....5-16

5.4. Comment Letters .....5-17

**Chapter 6. Acronyms, Abbreviations, and References .....6-1**

6.1. Acronyms and Abbreviations ..... 6-1

6.2. References..... 6-3

**List of Figures**

Figure 2.3-1. Kitsap County Base Map..... 2-5

Figure 2.6-1. Proposed UGA and Zoning Changes – North ..... 2-21

Figure 2.6-2. Proposed UGA and Zoning Changes – South..... 2-23

Figure 2.6-3. Preferred Alternative Comprehensive Plan – North ..... 2-25

Figure 2.6-4. Preferred Alternative Comprehensive Plan – South..... 2-27

Figure 2.6-5. Preferred Alternative Zoning – North..... 2-29

Figure 2.6-6. Preferred Alternative Zoning – South ..... 2-31

Figure 3.2-1. Preferred Alternative North..... 3-9

Figure 3.2-2. Preferred Alternative South ..... 3-11

Figure 3.2-3. No Action Alternative – North Residential Development Capacity ..... 3-15

Figure 3.2-4. No Action Alternative – South Residential Development Capacity..... 3-17

Figure 3.2-5. Project Deficient Roadway Segments – Preferred Alternative ..... 3-37

Figure 3.2-19. Projected Deficient Roadway Segments – Alternative 1 ..... 4-13

Table of Contents

Figure 3.2-20. Projected Deficient Roadway Segments – Alternative 2 ..... 4-15

Figure 3.2-21. Projected Deficient Roadway Segments – No Action Alternative..... 4-17

Figure 4.4-1. South Map Correction: No Action and Alternative 1 ..... 4-25

Figure 4.4-2. South Map Correction: Alternative 2..... 4-27

**List of Tables**

Table 1-1. Action Alternatives compared to the No Action Alternative ..... 1-13

Table 1-2. Comparison Matrix of Impacts..... 1-15

Table 1-3. Other Potential Mitigation Measures ..... 1-27

Table 2.6-1. Countywide Planning Policy Population Allocations..... 2-10

Table 2.6-2. Adjusted Allocations 2010-2025..... 2-12

Table 2.6-3. Overview of Alternatives..... 2-15

Table 2.6-4. Comparison of Land Capacity Assumptions..... 2-16

Table 2.6-5. Comparison of Growth Targets and Population Capacities..... 2-18

Table 2.6-6. Study UGA Acres ..... 2-19

Table 2.6-7. UGA and Land Use Comparisons ..... 2-33

Table 2.6-8. Proposed Policy Amendments ..... 2-34

Table 3.1-1. Estimated Percent Total Impervious Surface Area for Each Alternative ..... 3-3

Table 3.1-2. High and Low Estimates of Total and Percent Impervious Surface for the Preferred Alternative ..... 3-3

Table 3.2-1. Study UGA Acres by Alternative ..... 3-5

Table 3.2-2. UGA and Land Use Comparisons ..... 3-6

Table 3.2-3. Future Land Use Designation Distribution for Preferred Alternative (in acres)..... 3-7

Table 3.2-4. Existing Land Use Study UGAs by Alternative Boundaries..... 3-7

Table 3.2-10. Comparison of Growth Targets and Population Capacities..... 3-33

Table 3.2-11. Summary of Countywide Travel Statistics..... 3-34

Table 3.2-12. Projected Roadway Segment Deficiencies under the Alternatives by 2025 ..... 3-35

Table 3.2-13. Projected State Highway Deficiencies by 2025 ..... 3-39

Table 3.2-14. Description of Proposed Roadway Improvements – Preferred Alternative..... 3-40

Table 3.3-1. Countywide Population Assumptions by Alternative ..... 3-41

Table 3.3-2. Preferred Alternative - Public Buildings LOS Comparison ..... 3-42

Table 3.3-3. Preferred Alternative – Fire Protection LOS Comparison..... 3-43

Table 3.3-4. Preferred Alternative – Law Enforcement LOS Comparison ..... 3-44

Table 3.3-5. Preferred Alternative – Parks, Open Space, Trails, and Shoreline Access LOS Comparison ..... 3-44

Table 3.3-6.	Preferred Alternative – Schools LOS Comparison .....	3-45
Table 3.3-7.	Kitsap County Capital Facilities Projects and Financing for Preferred Alternative 2012-2025 (All Amounts Times \$1,000) .....	3-47
Table 3.3-8.	Sewer Cost Comparison by Alternative (Thousands \$).....	3-57
Table 3.3-9.	Water Consumption per Alternative.....	3-57
Table 3.3-10.	Demand for Library Services by Alternative .....	3-58
Table 3.3-11.	Library Facilities and Proximity of Study UGA Net Population Increases.....	3-59
Table 2.6-2.	Adjusted Allocations 2010-2025 .....	4-3
Table 2.6-5.	Comparison of Growth Targets and Population Capacities.....	4-4
Table 2.6-6.	Study UGA Acres .....	4-4
Table 2.6-6.	Study UGA Acres .....	4-4
Table 3.2-6.	Alternative 1 Future Land Use Designation Distribution by UGAs (in acres).....	4-6
Table 3.2-7.	Alternative 2 Future Land Use Designation Distribution by UGA (in acres) .....	4-6
Table 3.2-8.	No Action Alternative Future Land Use Designation Distribution by UGA (in acres) .....	4-7
Table 3.2-10.	Study UGA Acres .....	4-8
Table 3.2-10.	Study UGA Acres .....	4-8
Table 3.2-12.	CPP Consistency Analysis .....	4-8
Table 3.2-13	Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments – Action Alternatives .....	4-9
Table 3.2-20.	2025 Growth Targets by UGA and Rural Area (persons) .....	4-9
Table 3.2-22.	UGA Capacities.....	4-11
Table 3.3-51.	SSWM Capital Facilities Projects and Financing 2013-2025 (All Amounts Times \$1,000) .....	4-20
Table 3.3-58.	Library Facilities and Proximity of Study UGA Net Population Increases.....	4-23
Table 4.4-1.	Table of Figure Corrections – ULID6 Boundaries.....	4-24
Table 5.1.	Public Comments Received .....	5-1
Table 5.2.	Responses to Comments .....	5-4

**Appendices**

Appendix A – Kitsap County Trends Analysis

Appendix B – Land Capacity Worksheets

Appendix C – Preferred Alternative UGA maps

