

FINAL DRAFT

KITSAP COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN



2024



Thank you!

Sincere thanks to the entire Kitsap County community for lending your time to participate, learn and provide invaluable feedback and perspective.

COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Christine Rolfes
Charlotte Garrido
Katie Walters

COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Torie Brazitis

PLANNING COMMISSION

Aaron Murphy
Joe Phillips
Joey Soller
Kari Kaltenborn-Corey
Stacey Smith
Alan Beam
Steven Boe
Richard Shattuck

KITSAP COUNTY

Eric Baker
Scott Diener
Colin Poff
Jim Rogers
Kathlene Barnhart
Kirvie Mesebeluu-Yobech
Carla Lundgren
Melissa Shumake
Cindy Read
Jade Jarvis
Garrett Ballew
Heather Cleveland

CONSULTANT TEAM

Facet
LDC
Makers
Cascadia
Transpo Group
ECONorthwest



Land Acknowledgement

Kitsap County is located on 396 square miles of land within the ancestral territory of Native American Tribes named under three separate Treaties.

Medicine Creek Treaty – December 26, 1854

- Puyallup, Nisqually, and Squaxin Island Tribes

Point Elliot Treaty – January 22, 1855

- Muckleshoot, Snoqualmie, Suquamish, Tulalip, Stillaguamish, Swinomish, Sauk-Suiattle, Upper Skagit, Samish, Lummi, and Nooksack Tribes

Point No Point Treaty – January 26, 1855

- Jamestown S’Klallam, Skokomish, Elwha Klallam, and Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribes

All tribes who signed their specific treaties maintain their hunting, fishing, and gathering rights on “usual and accustomed” grounds which include land and waterways within Kitsap County.

With a deep historical connection and legacy of respect for the land and natural resources, these Tribal nations enrich Kitsap County through environmental stewardship, cultural heritage, and economic development, as well as collaboration with local governments to shape Kitsap County’s future.



Kitsap County Mission

Kitsap County Government exists to protect and promote the health, safety, and well-being of all County residents in an accessible, efficient, effective, and responsive manner.

Kitsap County Vision



KITSAP COUNTY VISION

AN ENGAGED AND CONNECTED COMMUNITY
Establish strong connections with and among residents, community groups, neighborhoods and organizations through timely, useful, inclusive, and responsive communication, outreach and events.

A RESILIENT COMMUNITY
Provide inclusive, accessible, and efficient government services that effectively inform and engage residents where they are, respecting local input in transparent decision making, acting always with professionalism and integrity.

A SAFE COMMUNITY
Engender a feeling of safety for all residents by promoting public and traffic safety through careful planning and intentional public facilities and infrastructure. People are protected and secure, have a sense of community, and care about their neighborhoods.

A VIBRANT COMMUNITY
Support a thriving local economy with a skilled workforce and successful entrepreneurs and small businesses, and provide expanded access to technology, innovative programs, and a welcoming, understandable regulatory environment.

A HEALTHY AND LIVABLE COMMUNITY
Enhance our quality of life through protection of our air quality, water quality, and natural systems and promote open spaces, walkable communities, accessible health care, and education and recreational opportunities that are welcoming to all people.

A WELL-GOVERNED COMMUNITY
Improve our ability to prepare for and adapt to population growth, economic shifts and climate changes through environmental safeguards, robust community-focused emergency preparedness and response, sustainable local food systems, diverse housing choices, expanded health care options, and a strong social safety net.



Table of Contents

Land Acknowledgement..... iii

Table of Contents v

Table of Figures ix

Introduction 13

 Key Focus Areas 14

 Housing 15

 Climate Change 15

 Centers 15

 Preliminary Alternatives 15

 Preferred Alternative 16

 The Planning Process and Public Participation 17

 Tribal Coordination 17

Chapter 1 / Land Use Element..... 19

 Vision 19

 Intent 19

 Growth Management Act Requirements and Regional Coordination 19

 Relationship to Other Elements 20

 Background 20

 Key Terms 24

 Land Use and Zoning Designations 25

 General Land Use Goals, Policies, and Strategies 34

 Urban Area Background 39

 Urban Designations 41

 Urban Growth Areas 43

 Centers 52

 Urban Area Land Use Goals, Policies, and Strategies 57

 Rural Area Background 61

 Rural Designations 63

 LAMIRDs 64

 Rural Land Use Goals, Policies, and Strategies 69

 Resource Lands Background 72

 Resource Lands Designations 73

 Resource Lands Goals, Policies, and Strategies 74

 References 75



Chapter 2 / Economic Development Element78

Vision78

Intent78

Growth Management Act and Regional Coordination.....78

Relationship to Other Elements79

Background80

Key Terms.....81

Economic Development Goals, Policies, and Strategies.....82

References89

Chapter 3 / Environment Element91

Vision91

Intent91

GMA Goals and Regional Coordination91

Relationship to Other Elements92

Background92

Key Terms.....95

Environment Goals, Policies and Strategies97

References103

Chapter 4 / Housing Element105

Vision105

Intent105

Growth Management Act and Regional Coordination.....105

Relationship to Other Elements106

Background106

Affordable Housing Programs.....117

Key Terms.....119

Housing Goals, Policies, and Strategies121

Human Services Goals, Policies, and Strategies126

References128

Chapter 5 / Transportation Element.....130

Vision130

Intent130

Growth Management Act and Regional Coordination.....130

Relationship to Other Elements131

Background132

Key Terms.....133

Transportation Goals, Policies, and Strategies135

References143



Chapter 6 / Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element 145

Vision 145

Intent 145

Growth Management Act and Regional Coordination 146

Relationship to Other Elements 146

Background 147

Key Terms..... 149

Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Goals, Policies and Strategies..... 151

References 156

Chapter 7 / Capital Facilities and Utilities Element 159

Vision 159

Intent 159

Growth Management Act and Regional Coordination..... 159

Relationship to Other Elements 160

Background 161

Key Terms..... 162

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goals, Policies, and Strategies 163

References 176

Chapter 8 / Climate Change Element 178

Vision 178

Intent 178

Growth Management Act & Regional Coordination 178

Relationship to Other Elements 179

Background 179

Key Terms..... 181

Climate Resilience and Adaptation Sub-Element 182

Climate Resilience and Adaptation Goals and Policies 184

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Sub-Element 193

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Reduction Goals and Policies 194

Resources 198

Subarea and Neighborhood Plans 200

Kingston Subarea Plan 202

Vision for Kingston 202

Kingston Goals, Policies, and Strategies 206

Manchester Subarea Plan 220

Vision for Manchester 220

Manchester Goals, Policies, and Strategies 221



Silverdale Regional Center Subarea Plan227

 Introduction 227

 Vision for Silverdale Regional Center 229

 “An Emerging Downtown” 230

 Silverdale Context 231

 Assets 231

 Challenges 232

 Opportunities 233

 Physical Context 234

 Population, Housing, and Employment Characteristics 235

 Transportation and Street Network 236

 Building Configurations and Types 237

 Development Characteristics and Trends 238

 Open Space Patterns 238

 Silverdale Regional Center Goals and Policies 239

 Implementation 253

Silverdale Subarea Plan 260

 Vision for Silverdale Subarea 260

 Silverdale Subarea Plan Goals and Policies 263

Suquamish Subarea Plan 270

 Vision for Suquamish 270

 Suquamish Goals, Policies, and Strategies 272

Gorst Neighborhood Plan278

 Vision for Gorst 278

 Gorst Goals, Policies, and Strategies 280

Illahee Neighborhood Plan285

 Vision for Illahee 285

 Illahee Goals and Policies 286

Keyport Neighborhood Plan 291

 Vision for Keyport 291

 Keyport Goals and Policies 292

Appendix A. Housing Element Technical Analysis

Appendix B. Housing Availability and Affordability Analysis

Appendix C. Racially Disparate Impacts Analysis

Appendix D. Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy



Table of Figures

Figure 1. Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative27

Figure 2. Commissioner District 1 (North Kitsap) Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative (next page).....28

Figure 3. Commissioner District 2(South Kitsap) Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative (next page).....30

Figure 4. Commissioner District 3 (Central Kitsap) Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative.....32

Figure 5. Urban Growth Areas Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative40

Figure 6. Kingston UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative43

Figure 7. Poulsbo UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative 44

Figure 8. Silverdale UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative45

Figure 9. Central Kitsap UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative46

Figure 10. Bremerton East UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative47

Figure 11. Bremerton West UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative48

Figure 12. Gorst UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative49

Figure 13. Puget Sound Industrial Center – Bremerton UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative50

Figure 14. Port Orchard UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative 51

Figure 17. McWilliams Countywide Center Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative.....55

Figure 20. Map of Type III Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development.....68



Figure 21. Water Resource Inventory Area 15 Map.....93

Figure 22. Map of Kitsap County in relation to neighboring counties and cities 107

Figure 23. Year-over-year percent change in population, 1990-2022..... 108

Figure 24. Housing units in cities and the unincorporated county, 2023..... 108

Figure 25. Household Tenure in Occupied Units, Kitsap County, 2000-2020..... 114

Figure 26. Share of cost burden by tenure in occupied units, Kitsap County, 2000 to 2020..... 115

Figure 27. PSRC Displacement Risk Map for Kitsap County 116

Figure 28. GHG Emissions Sources, 2022..... 180

Figure 29. Kingston UGA Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative 204

Figure 30. Kingston Countywide Center Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative..... 205

Figure 31. Manchester LAMIRD Zoning map 221

Figure 32. Silverdale Regional Center Planning Area and Boundary 228

Figure 33. Silverdale’s Dyes Inlet waterfront setting and upland view views. 229

Figure 34. A vision for Silverdale: a mixed-use center with welcoming streetscapes and open spaces..... 230

Figure 35. Big box retail stores and large parking lots dominate the visual character of Silverdale..... 233

Figure 36. Old Town Silverdale..... 234

Figure 37. Silverdale connectivity challenges and possible future connections 237

Figure 38. Examples of integrated plazas and open spaces. 242

Figure 39. Kitsap Transit long range transit plan, service and capital projects..... 245

Figure 40. Bicycle infrastructure examples..... 246

Figure 41. Examples of through-block connections..... 246

Figure 42. Circulation network example integrating public streets and through-block connections 247

Figure 43. Silverdale Regional Center Implementation Table 253

Figure 44. Silverdale Zoning Map – Board Directed Preferred Alternative..... 262



Figure 45. Suquamish LAMIRD Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative 271

Figure 46. Gorst UGA Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative 279

Figure 47. Illahee Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative 286

Figure 48. Keyport Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative 292





SILVERDALE DOG PARK, WA

Introduction



Introduction

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) requires cities and counties to update their Comprehensive Plans every ten years. The Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 2024-2044 (“Comp Plan”) serves as the policy document that helps guide decisions on services for a wide range of critical County programs, such as building roads, ensuring land for housing is available, and protecting the environment.

The Comp Plan is released concurrently with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). This document includes the intent, background information, existing conditions, and various goals, policies, and strategies for the following eight elements: Land Use, Economic Development, Environment, Housing, Transportation, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Capital Facilities and Utilities, and Climate Change. Subarea Plans for specific geographical areas are also included as part of the Plan. The Comp Plan elements are organized and presented in the following manner:

- **Vision:** Provides an overview and description of the element and its relation to the Comp Plan.
- **Intent:** Explains how the element fits into the Comp Plan and why the element is important.
- **GMA Requirements and Regional Coordination:** Indicates the policy directives on how growth management planning will occur. These requirements establish overarching practices and explain the section’s importance to planning Kitsap County’s future. This section supports the goals and policies.
- **Relationship to Other Elements:** Demonstrates how the elements are interconnected, dependent, and supportive of one another.
- **Background Information/Existing Conditions:** Provides the foundational context necessary to develop an understanding of where the County has been and where it is currently, to appreciate where the County is intending to go.
- **Key Terms:** Uncommon terms or phrases used within the element.
- **Goals and Policies:** Goals provide guidance to the County for the desired accomplishments within the element, while policies direct how these goals may be accomplished.
- **Strategies for Implementation:** Strategies are descriptions of how and when certain actions will be prioritized. Many strategies are tied with budget decisions and other annual program plans. Strategies from non-County plans may be considered, adopted, or not implemented dependent on priorities and available resources.

The Comprehensive Plan emphasizes growth and future development in a sustainable manner. Kitsap County leadership and staff use an inclusive and equitable approach to planning and decision-making that aims to balance housing needs, employment opportunities, transportation enhancements, and the protection of the natural environment. The Comp Plan demonstrates the County’s deep commitment

to maintaining and restoring ecosystems through habitat conservation, restoration of waterways, and reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. The Comp Plan establishes requirements that support and encourage a healthy environment, affordable living, and ample resources that are attainable and sustainable for residents now and in the future. The Comp Plan was updated based on residential and employment targets that align with the regional growth strategy (VISION 2050) provided by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). The Comp Plan addresses each of the important policy areas presented in VISION 2050, such as:

- Provide opportunities for all
- Increase housing choices and affordability
- Sustain a strong economy
- Significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions
- Keep the region moving
- Restore the health of the Puget Sound
- Protect a network of open spaces
- Grow in centers and near transit
- Act collaboratively and support local efforts

Throughout each element of the Comp Plan, special attention was paid to the diversity and equity implications of the goals, policies, and strategies to ensure that all residents within Kitsap County benefit from the intentions set forth. There is a special focus on purposeful and inclusive outreach for public engagement and involvement. The Comprehensive Plan 2024-2044 strives for an equitable distribution of county resources and opportunities for all residents who work, live, play, or visit Kitsap County.

KEY FOCUS AREAS

Since the county's last update was adopted in 2016, new state legislation for housing targets (HB 1220) and Climate Change (HB 1181) have altered how the County is required to plan. In addition to addressing these prominent issues, the Comprehensive Plan also must be updated for consistency with state and regional planning efforts, such as Puget Sound Regional Council's VISION 2050 and the Countywide Planning Policies adopted in 2021. This includes meeting population and employment targets and housing targets by income band. Although there are many objectives to plan for, the 2024 update has three focus areas:

- Housing
- Climate Change
- Centers (Silverdale, Kingston, McWilliams/303)



HOUSING

Housing is a fundamental need. Kitsap County is responsible for providing policy direction that facilitates housing for residents in all economic segments. Kitsap County has an adopted housing target of 14,497 new units through 2044. Much of these units need to be affordable to income segments 80% Area Median Income or lower, which requires producing more multi-family, townhome, and other housing types. The County encourages and supports a diverse and integrated mix of housing that includes housing for all ages, family types, abilities and limitations, household sizes, backgrounds, cultures, and incomes.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Climate change is a new, and key, focus area for the Comprehensive Plan 2024-2044. The Climate Change element takes a proactive approach to addressing impacts on infrastructure and natural systems, while increasing the County's resiliency by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and advancing environmental justice. The Comprehensive Plan encourages environmental protection through the dual lenses of intrinsic value and as an asset, by promoting conservation and environmentally sound development methods, such as low-impact landscaping and green building.

CENTERS

Centers are a critical part of Kitsap County's planning efforts and growth strategy. At the regional level, PSRC identifies 29 Regional Growth Centers, which include two in Kitsap County: Silverdale and Bremerton. Kitsap County also identifies two Countywide Centers: Kingston and McWilliams (located in Central Kitsap UGA). The Comprehensive Plan update focuses on strategies to encourage growth in these centers, improve design standards for mixed-use and transit-oriented development, and prioritize funding and investments to Centers.

PRELIMINARY ALTERNATIVES

In April of 2023, Kitsap County established three preliminary land use alternatives. The purpose of these preliminary alternatives was to compare different futures against each other in a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). The three alternatives were developed using different approaches to balancing growth targets for population, employment, and housing. They also included major policy initiatives such as heights, densities, parking, tree canopy, environmental protections, and others. The County also solicited land use reclassification requests. A total of 86 reclassification requests were received, and many of those were studied in the preliminary alternative most closely related to that request.

The three preliminary alternatives were:

Alternative 1 “No Action”

Alternative 1 used current land use, urban growth area sizes and configurations, zoning, and development regulations. Generally, it did not accommodate future population and employment growth, but it established baseline for environmental review and potential changes in action alternatives (Alternatives 2 and 3).

Alternative 2 “Compact Growth/Urban Center Focus”

Alternative 2 was based on meeting proposed population and employment distributions set by VISION 2050 and the Countywide Planning Policies (“bending the trend” of past growth patterns). Targeted growth around high-capacity transit facilities and routes. Focused growth in multi-family and commercial zones with an emphasis on the Silverdale Regional Center and Kingston countywide center as well the associated UGAs of Bremerton, Port Orchard, and Poulsbo. Reduced pressure of growth on rural areas by keeping UGA boundaries limited. Proposed substantial increased housing diversity with an emphasis on new multifamily housing types (e.g. row houses, low story multifamily, cottage housing). New residential and employment development encouraged to be constructed vertically in areas of infill or redevelopment. Proposed incentives and regulation revisions to promote these new development patterns. Alternative 2 was most closely aligned with population targets and housing need based on Commerce Guidance.

Alternative 3 “Dispersed Growth”

Alternative 3 was closer to past growth trends, housing, and employment types. Minor increase to growth opportunities in rural areas. Some UGA expansions but, countywide, UGAs are generally stable. Proposed new policies and regulations that may reduce development potential in UGAs. Opportunities are provided in the rural areas for additional rural housing and employment. Exceeded employment growth targets and included less population growth than Alternative 2. Did not meet housing targets.

PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

Following the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement and significant public comment, the Board of County Commissioners selected a Preferred Alternative. This alternative was most aligned with Alternative 2 (with modifications), and includes the following decisions:

- All rural-to-rural reclassification requests deferred to a later planning process (2025+).
- Multi-family and missing middle housing promoted through regulation revisions and incentives are necessary to promote housing diversity.
- Maximum densities and heights increased, particularly in Regional and Countywide Centers.
- Parking, lot size, and lot dimension regulations revised.
- Expedited permitting should be available to multi-family projects in the Centers.



- The Preferred Alternative should assess development limitations based on the environmental protections included in the March 8th Draft Critical Areas Ordinance.
- Tree canopy requirements should be established that strongly incentivize the retention of mature and/or significant trees.

This comprehensive plan is consistent with the Preferred Alternative.

THE PLANNING PROCESS AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The County followed a Public Participation Plan that included numerous opportunities for engagement and public comment with the general public and interested parties. The objective of this approach was to engage a diverse population equitably and inclusively, so that the Plan is well-grounded in the experiences and knowledge of the residents of Kitsap County. Through public engagement, the County was able to better understand the potential negative and positive impacts of the Comprehensive Plan and present these perspectives to elected officials.

Project Kick-off Public Meeting: introduced the project and solicited public participation and comments.

Virtual Meetings: focused on key topics such as land use and economic development, housing, environment and climate change, parks and open space, and transportation and capital facilities.

In-person and Hybrid Open House Events: to receive feedback on the draft alternatives and maps prior to moving forward to the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners for public consideration.

Consultations: offered to key communities including Community Advisory Committees, the Department Advisory Group, local business and interest associations, minority and low-income communities, young residents of Kitsap County, and environmental interest groups.

Focused Outreach: staff conducted in-person meetings/consultations to answer questions about the project or obtain feedback from interested parties.

Website and Social Media: used for outreach and release of project information.

Electronic Notification: Project announcements were sent at all major milestones to interested parties and community members via Constant Contact and GovDelivery services.

Local News Outlets: The County updated local news media throughout the process, including the Kitsap Sun and Kitsap Daily News.

TRIBAL COORDINATION

Tribal Treaty rights are considered throughout all elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Kitsap County encompasses land within the ancestral territory of Native American Tribes named under three separate Treaties. The County is committed to coordinating with Native American Tribes in its planning processes and continues to enhance government-to-government relations. Kitsap County will continue to work with tribal representatives in its planning efforts and policies to protect cultural and natural resources.



SILVERDALE WA

CHAPTER 1

Land Use Element



Chapter 1 / Land Use Element

VISION

Kitsap’s vision is for urban areas that are the region’s centers for diverse employment and housing opportunities, all levels of education, and civic and cultural activities. The vision for rural areas and communities is to retain and enhance unique historical character, appearance, and function, including recreation and natural resource activities, such as forestry, agriculture, and mining, that contribute to the rural character and economy.

INTENT

The Land Use Element’s intent is to direct the majority of growth toward urban areas, provide greater distinction between urban and rural areas, guide land use patterns to allow for the efficient provision of urban services such as sewers and transportation systems, preserve open space, recognize and preserve historical and archaeological resources, and ensure compatibility between adjacent zones.

The Land Use goals and policies recognize the County residents’ desire for healthy urban areas that are the region’s centers for diverse employment, housing opportunities, educational opportunities for K-12, technical training and college-level instruction, and civic and cultural activities. The goals and policies also recognize that rural areas and communities have unique historical characteristics, appearances, and functions that should be retained and enhanced. Natural resource activities, such as forestry, agriculture, and mining continue to contribute to the rural character and economy and are also guided by goals and policies in this element.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT REQUIREMENTS AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) is the framework for all land use planning in the state and lays out the requirements for comprehensive plans and development regulations that implement the plans. The Land Use Element is a required element and must include:

- Distribution, general location, and extent of land for resource production, commerce, housing, recreation, public facilities, and other land uses;
- Population densities, building intensities, and future population growth estimates;
- Protection of groundwater;
- Environmental justice considerations;
- Promotion of physical activity and reduction of vehicle miles traveled;
- Stormwater provisions, including considerations for Puget Sound; and
- Tools to reduce wildfire risk.

As with the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, Land Use goals and policies must reflect the requirements of the GMA as outlined above, be consistent with Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) VISION 2050 plan and its Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs), and conform to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) adopted by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC).

Because land use planning intersects with so many other policy areas, the County maintains working relationships with local school districts, the Kitsap Public Health District, Kitsap Transit, local Tribes, the Navy, local business organizations, and local social welfare non-profit groups.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

Land Use goals and policies in this element serve as the basis for the other comprehensive plan elements, including Economic Development, Environment, Housing, Transportation, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Capital Facilities and Utilities, and Climate Change. Specifically impacted are urban and rural residential development, commercial development, industrial and business lands, open space, historic preservation, and drainage, flooding, and stormwater management.

BACKGROUND

The Land Use Element plays the central role of guiding urban, rural, and resource land use patterns and decisions as well as decision-making processes for the unincorporated portions of Kitsap County. In keeping with state law, the County fulfills this responsibility of shaping land use primarily by regulatory means such as zoning, subdivision, critical areas, and shoreline ordinances.

The County and the cities within the county select a specific growth forecast through adoption of the CPPs. These county-level forecasts are distributed among the jurisdictions through a cooperative process. The Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) – composed of participating elected officials from the region’s governmental entities – is the body charged with approving such allocations.

Based on the Puget Sound Regional Council’s VISION 2050 and Regional Growth Strategy, the KRCC updated its growth targets for population and employment in 2022 through the CPPs. The CPPs established growth targets from 2020-2044. For purposes of this update, the targets were updated to 2022 from the 2020 census data using historic growth rates for better comparison with land capacity data. These targets are shown in Tables 1 and 2 below.



Table 1. Estimated Population Growth Targets 2022

UGA	Census Population 2020	CPP Targeted Growth 2020-2044	Adjusted Growth 2022-2044
Bremerton	10,105	2,762	2,544
Silverdale	19,675	9,896	9,442
Kingston	2,435	3,200	3,121
Poulsbo	528	1,065	1,054
Port Orchard	15,370	3,552	3,486
Central Kitsap	24,741	5,000	4,787
Rural	106,865	5,415	4,391
Total	179,719	30,890	28,825

Sources: Targets from the Countywide Planning Policies and extrapolated based upon historic growth patterns.

Table 2. Estimated Employment Growth Targets 2022-2044

UGA	Census Employment 2020	CPP Targeted Growth 2020-2044	Adjusted Growth 2022-2044
Bremerton	1,401	2,434	2,454
Silverdale	13,281	11,416	11,023
Kingston	1,077	1,400	1,343
Poulsbo	78	97	103
Port Orchard	2,683	1,500	1,429
Central Kitsap	3,985	1,470	1,380
Rural	22,896	2,301	2,150
Total	45,401	20,618	19,882

Sources: Targets from the Countywide Planning Policies and extrapolated based upon historic growth patterns.

Per the Kitsap CPPs, designated Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) are intended to accommodate at least 76 percent of the 20-year planning period’s population growth, based on official population forecasts adopted by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM). The existing urban/rural percentage split is 71 percent urban and 29 percent rural per the 2020 Buildable Lands Report (BLR). In 2022, Kitsap County re-adopted residential growth projections through 2044 integrating the 76 percent urban/24 percent rural objective. Consequently, there’s an increasing emphasis in focusing most growth into Kitsap County cities and unincorporated UGA areas.

To accommodate these growth targets, the Comprehensive Plan directs future residential and employment growth within the unincorporated portions of the county. Future population growth is accommodated by the capacity of residential units. The 2021 Buildable Land Report (BLR) established a methodology used by the KRCC cities and County to assess land capacity for residential and employment lands. Generally, this land capacity analysis uses the following steps to assess the capacity for lands with Kitsap’s UGAs to accommodate population and employment growth. Please see the 2021 BLR for a detailed description of this methodology.

Population capacity is determined by:

- Analyzing the amount of land in each zone that allows residential units that is vacant or underutilized.
- Market factors and trends. This includes estimating how many units can be expected to develop on that land in the 20-year planning horizon based on historical patterns. This also assumes that a percentage of properties might not be developed due to property owner decision and financial conditions.
- Adjustments accounting for other land undevelopable for residential units due to critical areas and public facility and road needs.
- Assumed densities of future development by zone.
- Typical household size.

A similar method is used for employment capacity:

- Analyzing the amount of land in each zone that allows employment uses that is vacant or underutilized.
- Market factors and trends. This includes estimating how many units can be expected to develop on that land in the 20-year planning horizon based on historical patterns. This also assumes that a percentage of properties might not be developed due to property owner decision and financial conditions.
- Adjustments accounting for other land undevelopable for employment uses due to critical areas and public facility and road needs.
- Assumed lot coverage of future development by zone.



- Assumed square feet needed per employee based on employment use.

Using this methodology, the County and cities apply assumptions based on the local circumstances of their jurisdictions. For unincorporated Kitsap, assumptions were applied based on geographic limitations of the area, zoning, location within a regional or countywide center, state guidance, and/or countywide circumstances.

In developing its land capacity analysis for the preferred alternative, Kitsap applied different assumptions based upon major policy or regulation changes (e.g., greater densities and land use intensities in urban centers, greater critical area buffers and tree canopy requirements). The land capacity analysis, using these assumptions, determined the number of persons and jobs that could be accommodated. These capacities were then compared against the population and employment growth targets. These comparisons are shown by UGA in Tables 3 and 4 below. Negative numbers (red text) indicate excess capacity while positive numbers (black text) indicate a shortage.

**Table 3. Comparison of Population Growth Targets to Land Capacity Analysis
(Board Directed Preferred Alternatives)**

UGA	Adjusted Growth 2022-2044	Land Capacity Preferred Alternative	Growth to Land Capacity Preferred Alternative 2022-2044
Bremerton	2,544	2,491	53
Silverdale	9,442	14,563	-5,121
Kingston	3,121	3,271	-150
Poulsbo	1,054	922	132
Port Orchard	3,486	3,643	-157
Central Kitsap	4,787	5,611	-824
Rural	4,391	4,391	0
Total	28,825	34,892	-6,067

Sources: Estimates updated from Countywide Planning Policies and Kitsap County's land capacity analysis.

Table 4. Comparison of Employment Growth Targets (2022-2044) to Land Capacity (Board Directed Preferred Alternatives)

UGA	Adjusted Growth 2022-2044	Land Capacity Preferred Alternative	Growth to Land Capacity Preferred Alternative 2022-2044
Bremerton	2,454	3,922	-1,468
Silverdale	11,023	10,391	632
Kingston	1,343	801	542
Poulsbo	103	90	13
Port Orchard	1,429	1,106	323
Central Kitsap	1,380	1,276	104
Rural	2,150	2,150	n/a
Total	19,882	19,736	146

Sources: Estimates updated from Countywide Planning Policies and Kitsap County's land capacity analysis.

KEY TERMS

Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU)– a dwelling unit located on the same lot as a single-family housing unit, duplex, triplex, townhome, or other housing unit. ADUs may be attached or detached.

Food deserts– areas where people have limited access to a variety of healthy and affordable food (USDA.gov)

Low-rise residential or apartments– buildings that are three stories or less. They are commonly served by stair access. They are also frequently referred to as walk-up apartments or garden apartments.

Middle housing– describes buildings that are compatible in scale, form, and character with single-family houses and contain two or more attached, stacked, or clustered homes including duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, sixplexes, townhouses, stacked flats, courtyard apartments, and cottage housing.

Mid-rise residential or apartments– buildings that are between four to eight stories and served by elevator access. They generally feature some form of structured parking (above and/or below grade).



Infill development– construction of buildings or other facilities on previously unused or underutilized land located within an existing urban area and typically surrounded by existing development.

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT)– a measure that calculates the sum of miles traveled by each vehicle over a defined period of time.

LAND USE AND ZONING DESIGNATIONS

Table 5 below illustrates the County’s Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations and corresponding implementing zones. Detailed descriptions for each land use designation are in Tables 6, 7, and 8 later in the element.

Table 5. Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations.

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation	Implementing Zones	Map Symbol	Density du = dwelling unit	
			Minimum	Maximum
Rural Residential	Rural Residential	RR	0	1 du/5 acres
Rural Protection	Rural Protection	RP	0	1 du/10 acres
Rural Wooded	Rural Wooded	RW	0	1 du/20 acres
Forest Resource Lands	Forest Resource Lands	FRL	0	
Mineral Resource Overlay	Mineral Resource Overlay	MRO	0	1 du/parcel
Urban Low-Density Residential	Urban Restricted	UR	1	5 du/1 acre
	Greenbelt	GB	1	4 du/1 acre
	Urban Low Residential	UL	5	9 14* du/1 acre
	Urban Cluster Residential	UCR	5	9 14* du/1 acre
Urban Medium-Density Residential	Urban Medium Residential	UM	10	30 du/1 acre
Urban High-Density Residential	Urban High Residential	UH	19	
Urban Low Intensity Mixed Use	Urban Village Center	UVC	10	no max
	Neighborhood Commercial	NC	10	30 du/1 acre
Urban High Intensity Mixed Use	Commercial	C	19	60 du/1 acre
	Regional Center	RC	19	no max
	Low Intensity Commercial	LIC	10	20 du/1 acre
Rural Commercial	Rural Commercial	RCO		

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designation	Implementing Zones	Map Symbol	Density du = dwelling unit	
			Minimum	Maximum
Urban Industrial	Business Center	BC	0	1 du/parcel
	Industrial	IND	0	1 du/parcel
Rural Industrial	Rural Industrial	RI	0	1 du/parcel
Public Facilities	Parks	P	0	1 du/parcel
Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) Type I	Keyport Village Commercial	KVC		
	Keyport Village Low Residential	KVLR		
	Keyport Village Residential	KVR		
	Manchester Village Commercial	MVC		
	Manchester Village Low Residential	MVL		
	Manchester Village Residential	MVR		
	Port Gamble Rural Historic Town Commercial	RHTC		
	Port Gamble Rural Historic Town Residential	RHTR		
	Port Gamble Rural Historic Waterfront	RHTW		
	Suquamish Village Commercial	SVC		
	Suquamish Village Low Residential	SVLR		
	Suquamish Village Residential	SVR		
	Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) Type III	Rural Employment Center	REC	
Twelve Trees Employment Center		TTEC		

* 14 dwelling units/acre possible with middle housing types



Figure 1. Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative





Figure 2. Commissioner District 1 (North Kitsap) Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative (next page)



Commissioner District 1 - North Kitsap Zoning

DRAFT

- Legend**
- County Commissioner District Outlines
 - Regional/Countywide Growth Center
 - Urban Growth Area Boundary
 - Incorporated City Boundary
 - RR - Rural Residential (1 DU/5 Ac)
 - Mineral Resource/Rural Residential
 - RP - Rural Protection (1 DU/10 Ac)
 - RW - Rural Wooded (1 DU/20 Ac)
 - Mineral Resource/Rural Wooded
 - BC - Business Center
 - IND - Industrial
 - Mineral Resource/Industrial
 - Commercial (19-60 DU/Ac)
 - Regional Center (19 DU/Ac - no max)
 - NC - Neighborhood Commercial (10-30 DU/Ac)
 - RCO - Rural Commercial
 - REC - Rural Employment Center
 - RI - Rural Industrial
 - TTEC - Twelve Trees Employment Center
 - UCR - Urban Cluster Residential (5-9 DU/Ac)
(14 for Single Family attached only)
 - UR - Urban Restricted (1-5 DU/Ac)
 - UL - Urban Low Residential (5-9 DU/Ac)
(14 for Single Family attached only)
 - Urban Medium Residential (10-30 DU/Ac)
 - Urban High Residential (19-60 DU/Ac)
 - Urban Village Center (min 10 DU/Ac - no max)
 - KVC - Keyport Village Commercial
 - KVL - Keyport Village Low Residential
 - KVR - Keyport Village Residential
 - RHTC - Rural Historic Town Commercial
 - RHTR - Rural Historic Town Residential
 - RHTW - Rural Historic Town Waterfront
 - SVC - Suquamish Village Commercial
 - SVLR - Suquamish Village Low Residential
 - SVR - Suquamish Village Residential
 - Park
 - CITY - Incorporated City
 - MIL - Military
 - T - Tribal Land
 - Lake
 - Salt Water
 - LI - Light Industrial
 - RL - Residential Low



Preferred Alternative - Board of Commissioner Direction

This map was created from existing map sources, not from field surveys. Determination of fitness for use lies with the user, as does the responsibility for understanding the accuracy and limitations of this map and data.

The information on this map may have been collected from various sources and can change over time without notice.

While great care was taken in making this map, there is no guarantee or warranty of its accuracy as to labeling, placement or location of any geographic features present. This map is intended for informational purposes only and is not a substitute for a field survey.

Kitsap County and its officials and employees assume no responsibility or legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, reliability, or timeliness of any information on this map.



FINAL DRAFT



Map Published Date: April, 2024

0 0.5 1 2 3 4 Miles


Kitsap County Department of Community Development
 614 Division Street, MS-36, Port Orchard, Washington 98366
 VOICE (360) 337-5777 (Kitsap One) * <https://www.kitsapgov.com/>

Figure 3. Commissioner District 2(South Kitsap) Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative (next page)



Commissioner District 2 - South Kitsap Zoning

DRAFT



Legend

- County Commissioner District Outlines
- Urban Growth Area Boundary
- Incorporated City Boundary
- RR - Rural Residential (1 DU/5 Ac)
- Mineral Resource/Rural Residential
- RP - Rural Protection (1 DU/10 Ac)
- Mineral Resource/Rural Protection
- RW - Rural Wooded (1 DU/20 Ac)
- Mineral Resource/Rural Wooded
- FRL - Forest Resource Lands (1 DU/40 Ac)
- Mineral Resource/Forest Resource Lands
- BC - Business Center
- IND - Industrial
- Mineral Resource/Industrial
- Commercial (19-60 DU/Ac)
- NC - Neighborhood Commercial (10-30 DU/Ac)
- Low Intensity Commercial (10-30 DU/Ac)
- RCO - Rural Commercial
- REC - Rural Employment Center
- RI - Rural Industrial
- Greenbelt (1-4 DU/Ac)
- UR - Urban Restricted (1-5 DU/Ac)
- UL - Urban Low Residential (5-9 DU/Ac)
(14 for Single Family attached only)
- Urban Medium Residential (10-30 DU/Ac)
- Urban High Residential (19-60 DU/Ac)
- MVC - Manchester Village Commercial
- MVLR - Manchester Village Low Residential
- MVR - Manchester Village Residential
- Park
- CITY - Incorporated City
- MIL - Military
- Lake
- Salt Water

Preferred Alternative - Board of Commissioner Direction

FINAL DRAFT

This map was created from existing map sources, not from field surveys. Determination of fitness for use lies with the user, as does the responsibility for understanding the accuracy and limitations of this map and data.

The information on this map may have been collected from various sources and can change over time without notice.

While great care was taken in making this map, there is no guarantee or warranty of its accuracy as to labeling, placement or location of any geographic features present. This map is intended for informational purposes only and is not a substitute for a field survey.

Kitsap County and its officials and employees assume no responsibility or legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, reliability, or timeliness of any information on this map.

Map Published Date: April, 2024



Kitsap County Department of Community Development
 614 Division Street, MS-36, Port Orchard, Washington 98366
 VOICE (360) 337-5777 (Kitsap One) * <https://www.kitsapgov.com/>




Figure 4. Commissioner District 3 (Central Kitsap) Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioner Direction Preferred Alternative



Commissioner District 3 - Central Kitsap Zoning

DRAFT

- Legend**
- County Commissioner District Outlines
 - Regional/Countywide Growth Center
 - Urban Growth Area Boundary
 - Incorporated City Boundary
 - Airport Overlay Area
 - RR - Rural Residential (1 DU/5 Ac)
 - Mineral Resource/Rural Residential
 - RP - Rural Protection (1 DU/10 Ac)
 - Mineral Resource/Rural Protection
 - RW - Rural Wooded (1 DU/20 Ac)
 - Mineral Resource/Rural Wooded
 - FRL - Forest Resource Lands (1 DU/40 Ac)
 - Mineral Resource/Forest Resource Lands
 - BC - Business Center
 - IND - Industrial
 - Mineral Resource/Industrial
 - Commercial (19-60 DU/Ac)
 - Regional Center (19 DU/Ac - no max)
 - NC - Neighborhood Commercial (10-30 DU/Ac)
 - Low Intensity Commercial (10-30 DU/Ac)
 - RCO - Rural Commercial
 - RI - Rural Industrial
 - Greenbelt (1-4 DU/Ac)
 - UCR - Urban Cluster Residential (5-9 DU/Ac)
(14 for Single Family attached only)
 - UR - Urban Restricted (1-5 DU/Ac)
 - UL - Urban Low Residential (5-9 DU/Ac)
(14 for Single Family attached only)
 - Urban Medium Residential (10-30 DU/Ac)
 - Urban High Residential (19-60 DU/Ac)
 - KVC - Keyport Village Commercial
 - KVLR - Keyport Village Low Residential
 - KVR - Keyport Village Residential
 - MVC - Manchester Village Commercial
 - MVLR - Manchester Village Low Residential
 - MVR - Manchester Village Residential
 - SVC - Suquamish Village Commercial
 - SVLR - Suquamish Village Low Residential
 - SVR - Suquamish Village Residential
 - Park
 - CITY - Incorporated City
 - MIL - Military
 - T - Tribal Land
 - Lake
 - Salt Water
 - RL - Residential Low



Preferred Alternative - Board of Commissioner Direction

FINAL DRAFT

This map was created from existing map sources, not from field surveys. Determination of fitness for use lies with the user, as does the responsibility for understanding the accuracy and limitations of this map and data.

The information on this map may have been collected from various sources and can change over time without notice.

While great care was taken in making this map, there is no guarantee or warranty of its accuracy as to labeling, placement or location of any geographic features present. This map is intended for informational purposes only and is not a substitute for a field survey.

Kitsap County and its officials and employees assume no responsibility or legal liability for the accuracy, completeness, reliability, or timeliness of any information on this map.

Map Published Date: April, 2024



Kitsap County Department of Community Development
 614 Division Street, MS-36, Port Orchard, Washington 98366
 VOICE (360) 337-5777 (Kitsap One) * <https://www.kitsapgov.com/>



GENERAL LAND USE GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Goal 1. Land use pattern

Establish a development pattern consistent with the County's vision as expressed in the CPPs.

Land Use Policy 1.1. Designate the general distribution, location, and extent of the uses of land for housing, commerce, recreation, open spaces, public utilities and facilities, and other land uses.

Land Use Policy 1.2. Establish land use designations and densities as shown in Table 5.

Land Use Policy 1.3. Manage and maintain the County's Official Zoning Map to ensure continued consistency with the Future Land Use Map (see Figure 1).

Land Use Policy 1.4. Implement land use designations through a clear regulatory process that ensures transparency, fairness, and predictability in the land development process.

Land Use Strategy 1.a. Review, and revise as necessary, permitting processes to ensure clarity for applicants, meet and exceed state standards for processing times, and create equitable opportunities for comment and engagement for the public.

What is the difference between zoning and future land use?

Goal 1 and the policies and strategies that implement it address the establishment of land use designations and the link between future land use and the zoning map.

The future land use map shows where general desired future land uses and densities should occur, as well as areas that are suitable for development versus areas that should be protected.

The zoning map and zoning regulations, which implement the comprehensive plan, are more specific. Multiple zones may implement a land use designation, while a single zone cannot implement multiple land use designations.

Land Use Goal 2. Capital facilities

Channel growth to areas where adequate services can be provided.

Land Use Policy 2.1. Coordinate capital facilities with land use planning.

Land Use Policy 2.2. Coordinate with local jurisdictions to determine what regional public facilities are or will be needed and how these facilities will be located to best serve the public.

Land Use Policy 2.3. Reduce stormwater runoff.



Land Use Strategy 2.a. Ensure that capital facilities plans and priorities match the future land use map and growth strategies.

Land Use Strategy 2.b. Develop agreements with adjacent cities and affected service providers to site joint facilities and share costs of development.

Land Use Strategy 2.c. Hold annual cross-jurisdictional meetings to identify potential facility needs.

Land Use Strategy 2.d. Encourage development of regional stormwater facilities.

Land Use Strategy 2.e. Ensure compliance with the current Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.

Land Use Goal 3. Full and equal access

Evaluate land use actions and decisions for their impact on the provision of full and equal access to opportunities and resources for all residents, regardless of identity, community, or socioeconomic circumstances.

Land Use Policy 3.1. Update development regulations to reflect equitable land use planning and incorporate land use development and planning requirements informed by a full public process.

Land Use Strategy 3.a. Explore racial equity assessment tools (e.g., Racial Equity Impact Assessment Toolkit from Race Forward) to evaluate development regulation update proposals.

Land Use Strategy 3.b. Expand community outreach strategies to vulnerable populations in the development of regulation updates.

Land Use Goal 4. Property rights

Balance community rights for health, safety, and conservation of resources with the rights of private property owners in development regulations.

Land Use Policy 4.1. Review and retain regulations that serve to protect the public welfare, health, and safety.

Land Use Policy 4.2. Property owners are to be protected from arbitrary and capricious land use decisions and actions.

Land Use Policy 4.3. Require new development within UGAs to be served by urban levels of sewer and water.

Land Use Policy 4.4. New urban services and facilities shall be limited to UGAs, unless service extension is necessary to respond to a documented public health hazard caused by existing development which cannot otherwise reasonably be remedied.

Land Use Strategy 4.a. Compensation at fair market value shall be paid when property is taken wholly for public purposes.

Land Use Strategy 4.b. Evaluate proposals through a lens that clearly outlines the community rights that are affected as well as private property rights.

Land Use Goal 5. Compatibility with Naval Base Kitsap

Implement the strategies and recommendations of the 2015 Naval Base Kitsap Joint Land Use Study (JLUS).

Land Use Policy 5.1. Discourage the siting of incompatible uses near military bases that would affect the installations' military readiness or proposed future expansion.

Land Use Policy 5.2. Establish a list of recognized military "centers".

Land Use Policy 5.3. Recognize and consider the Manchester Fuel Depot freight route when new development and traffic improvements are proposed.

Land Use Policy 5.4. Coordinate with the Navy when infrastructure is contemplated that would induce incompatible growth near installations.

Land Use Strategy 5.a. Consider adopting overlay zones to prevent incompatible uses near installations.

Land Use Strategy 5.b. Commanding officers of military installations or their designees shall be notified any time development regulations or other planning actions that would affect properties surrounding the site are proposed to be changed.

Land Use Goal 6. Health and quality of life

Promote health and quality of life in the built environment.

Land Use Policy 6.1. Understand the impacts of land use decisions through such models as the social determinants of health (SDOH) approach, inclusive of income, housing, and transportation, to improve health outcomes.

Land Use Policy 6.2. Actively integrate amenities such as open space, trails, plazas, pedestrian features, tree canopies, and wildlife corridors within urban growth areas.

Land Use Policy 6.3. Plan for and implement an expanded network of trails.

Land Use Policy 6.4. Link non-motorized planning requirements to land use planning decisions.

Land Use Policy 6.5. Actively seek new opportunities for public waterfront access, especially in support of the Kitsap Peninsula Water Trails system, while preserving existing public waterfront access.



Land Use Policy 6.6. Encourage land use that removes barriers to expansion of medical and health care opportunities, focusing on services to seniors and other underserved communities.

Land Use Strategy 6.a. Adopt, review, and update as necessary development regulations for requirements and incentives for facilities that promote active living and their inclusion in developments.

Land Use Strategy 6.b. Participate in a leadership role in discussions of the Kitsap Health Care Continuum.

Land Use Goal 7. Historic, archaeological, and cultural resources

Preserve and celebrate historic, archaeological, and cultural resources.

Land Use Policy 7.1. Establish procedures to preserve significant historic, archaeological, and cultural resources.

Land Use Policy 7.2. Engage with affected tribes and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation on development proposals that may have impacts to cultural and historic resources.

Land Use Strategy 7.a. Inventory cultural resources throughout Kitsap County to be preserved by coordinating with local historical organizations, tribal governments, and Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation.

Land Use Strategy 7.b. Consider the need for pre-ground disturbance site investigations for sites where predictive model show cultural resources are likely or when requested by affected Native American tribes and Nations.

Land Use Strategy 7.c. Explore development of a historic preservation ordinance that grants the County status as a Certified Local Government.

Land Use Strategy 7.d. Explore grant funding available to Certified Local Governments to produce a historic preservation plan that will prioritize future preservation grant efforts.

Land Use Goal 8. Food security, systems, and production

Promote food security, food systems, local food production, and public health by encouraging locally based food production, distribution, and choice.

Land Use Policy 8.1. Promote inter-agency and intergovernmental cooperation to expand community gardening opportunities.

Land Use Policy 8.2. Support the development and adoption of joint-use agreements on publicly owned sites or institutional facilities to allow gardens, distribution, and sales.

Land Use Policy 8.3. Prioritize underserved communities, including communities with food deserts, as areas for potential locations for community gardens, farmers markets, and local food access programs.

Land Use Strategy 8.a. Adopt initiatives that will enhance urban and rural agriculture, community gardens, farmers markets, and food access.

Land Use Strategy 8.b. Consider allowing alternative retail models including pop-ups and mobile markets.

Land Use Goal 9. Airport compatibility

Ensure that land use decisions comport with Growth Management Act requirements concerning general aviation airports.

Land Use Policy 9.1. Discourage the siting of incompatible uses near airports.

Land Use Policy 9.2. Land use decisions near or within the operating envelope of an airport must not compromise air safety.

Land Use Policy 9.3. Consult with the owners and operators of general aviation airports prior to changing comprehensive plan or development regulations that may affect the use.

Land Use Strategy 9.a. Require notice to title for uses within 800 feet of airports, related operations, and aviation (aircraft navigation) easements.

Land Use Strategy 9.b. Establish an airport overlay adjacent to the Apex Airpark and discuss future limitations on development acknowledging state and federal guidance.



URBAN AREA BACKGROUND

Washington State’s GMA requires that counties encourage urban growth in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner. GMA defines “Urban Growth” as growth that makes intensive use of land for the location of denser population, buildings, structures, and impermeable surfaces to such a degree as to be incompatible with the primary use of land for the production of food, other agricultural products, or fiber, or the extraction of mineral resources, rural uses, rural development, and natural resource lands. This is achieved through the designation of UGAs.

UGAs are to be sized so that the broad range of needs and uses associated with urban growth are accommodated for over the twenty-year planning horizon. This includes non-residential uses such as medical, governmental, institutional, commercial, service, retail uses, and open spaces, as well as urban densities of housing. This sizing is calculated based on the land capacity analysis which was outlined in the background of this element.



URBAN DESIGNATIONS

Table 6. Kitsap County's Urban Land Use Designations and Associated Zoning

Urban Low-Density Residential
<p>This designation provides for a mix of low-density residential uses that are appropriate for urban level densities but are either further away from transit and commercial services than the Urban Medium or Urban High-Density Residential, and/or include regulated environmentally critical areas. Primary uses include single-family dwellings and middle housing types (duplexes, triplexes, townhouses, cottage housing, and accessory dwelling units). Implementing zones include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban Restricted (2646 acres) • Greenbelt (545 acres) • Urban Low Residential (9316 acres) <p style="text-align: center;">Urban Cluster Residential (504 acres)</p>
Urban Medium-Density Residential
<p>This designation provides for a mix of middle housing types and low-rise multifamily residential uses on lands suitable for this level of urban development. This designation accommodates development that serves as a transitional buffer between lower density zones and high density/intensity zones. Development is required to occur at densities that make efficient use of public investments in infrastructure, facilitate public transit, and promote pedestrian and other non- motorized transportation. This designation is appropriate in areas near commercial services and/or transit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementing zone is: • Urban Medium Residential (1150 acres)
Urban High-Density Residential
<p>This designation provides for low- and mid-rise multifamily residential uses on lands suitable for this level of urban development. This designation requires development at densities that make efficient use of public investments in infrastructure, facilitate public transit, and promote pedestrian and other non- motorized transportation. Primary uses include low-rise and mid-rise apartments. This designation is appropriate in areas within walking distance of commercial services and/or transit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The implementing zone is: • Urban High Residential (554 acres)

Urban Low-Density Residential

Urban Low-Intensity Commercial/Mixed-Use

This designation provides for commercial uses serving residential neighborhoods and small- to medium-scale mixed-use development. Primary commercial uses include those serving quick stop shopping needs. Examples include but are not limited to supermarkets, drug stores, restaurants, laundry and dry-cleaning establishments, branch banks, and professional offices. Primary residential uses include middle housing types and low-rise apartments. This designation is appropriate in centralized areas that serve surrounding residential neighborhoods or in gateway areas along arterial roadways, but adjacent to low density residential areas.

- Implementing zones include:
- Neighborhood Commercial (247 acres)
- Urban Village Center (66 acres)

Urban High-Intensity Commercial/Mixed-Use

This designation provides for a mix of larger commercial and mixed-use centers, including commercial uses that require large sites and draw customers at the community and regional scale. Both a vertical and horizontal mix of commercial and residential uses are encouraged. Primary commercial uses include, but are not limited to, superstores, department stores, automotive parts and sales, home improvement stores, hotels and motels, and restaurants. Primary residential uses include low and mid-rise apartments. The implementing zones include:

- Commercial (1309 acres)
- Regional Center (702 acres)
- Low Intensity Commercial (73 acres)

Urban Industrial

This designation provides for a mix of industrial and business uses such as light manufacturing, hi-tech, warehousing, biotech, business parks, 4-year educational institutions, equipment, and vehicle repair, as well as heavy industrial activities and those requiring access to major transportation corridors.

- Implementing zones include:
- Business Center (204 acres)
- Industrial (818 acres)



URBAN GROWTH AREAS

Figure 6. Kingston UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Kingston UGA

The Kingston UGA (shown in Figure 6) includes the unincorporated community of Kingston and is located in the northern portion of the county adjacent to Puget Sound. The UGA is approximately 1,271 acres in size. The UGA includes the Kingston Countywide Center that consists of the Kingston old town, which has a small-town character with small-scale commercial uses, and a predominantly commercial area to the northwest. The remainder of the UGA is primarily single-family residential development. The UGA remains unassociated without a contiguous incorporated jurisdiction. The community will explore incorporation during the planning period but may be limited by population and revenue opportunities. Kitsap County expects to continue to be the provider of planning and urban services for this area. Goals and policies related to Kingston can be found in the Kingston Sub-Area Plan.

Washington State Ferries and Kitsap Transit fast ferries both connect Kingston to the east side of Puget Sound, and this easier access has increased development pressure on Kingston.

Figure 7. Poulsbo UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative




Poulsbo UGA

The City of Poulsbo is located along Liberty Bay about 11 miles southwest of Kingston. The Poulsbo UGA (shown in Figure 7) includes several unincorporated areas adjacent to the City of Poulsbo, totaling approximately 410 acres in size. The unincorporated UGA has a suburban character of predominantly single-family residential development. Many areas of the UGA have views of Liberty Bay and the Olympic Mountains.

The Poulsbo UGA was associated with the City of Poulsbo with the adoption of the Poulsbo Sub- Area Plan in 2002. To ensure consistent development patterns between those properties inside the City and those inside the unincorporated UGA, the City and County adopted an interlocal agreement to address development regulations within the unincorporated UGA. Through this agreement, the City’s zoning and subdivision regulations apply to the development of properties within the unincorporated UGA. Updates to this agreement to simplify and streamline permit processing within the UGA are currently being discussed by the jurisdictions.



Figure 9. Central Kitsap UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Central Kitsap UGA

The Central Kitsap UGA (shown in Figure 9) is located between Dyes Inlet to the west and Port Orchard Bay to the east and is generally southeast of the Silverdale UGA and north of the City of Bremerton and its UGAs. The Central Kitsap UGA includes approximately 5,575 acres. It has a predominantly suburban single-family character, with commercial uses concentrated primarily along SR 303 and some multi-family residential uses. The UGA includes the Ilahee community and the McWilliams/303 Countywide Center. The Central Kitsap UGA is associated with the City of Bremerton.

The City of Bremerton, through its adopted comprehensive plan and water system plan, has shown interest in the future annexation of this UGA. Any annexation of the area should include discussion of provision of urban services and revenue sharing. The close proximity of this UGA to the Bremerton East UGA requires coordination of planning between these two urban areas.




Figure 10. Bremerton East UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Bremerton East UGA

The Bremerton East UGA (shown in Figure 10) includes two unincorporated areas located adjacent to the eastern portion of the City of Bremerton. The two UGAs are located between the Central Kitsap UGA and city boundaries, and total approximately 1,094 acres. The Bremerton East UGA is primarily suburban in character, with most of its land in single-family residential use and some commercial development along the SR 303 corridor. The Bremerton East UGA was associated with the City of Bremerton in the adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. Through future annexations, it is expected that much of this UGA will become part of the City over the next 20 years.

Figure 11. Bremerton West UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Bremerton West UGA

The Bremerton West UGA (shown in Figure 11) includes three unincorporated areas located adjacent to the western portion of the City of Bremerton (one of these is a pocket of unincorporated area surrounded by land that is part of the city). Together, these areas total approximately 1,918 acres. The Rocky Point portion of the UGA is primarily single-family residential in character. The Navy Yard City/National Avenue portion of the UGA contains commercial and industrial uses along with small-lot single-family residential development. The western pocket of the UGA (surrounded by city land) is predominantly residential. The Bremerton West UGA was associated with the City of Bremerton in the adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. Through future annexations, it is expected that much of this UGA will become part of the City over the next 20 years.




Figure 12. Gorst UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Gorst UGA

The Gorst UGA (shown in Figure 12) is located at the western end of Sinclair Inlet at the junction of State Route (SR) 16 with SR 3. The UGA includes approximately 281 acres. The Gorst UGA is a relatively small highway-oriented commercial and industrial center with some small-lot single family residential development. It was associated with the City of Bremerton in 2008. Through future annexations, it is expected that this UGA will become part of the City over the next 20 years. Due to significant public health concerns regarding failing septic systems in the area, the County and the City of Bremerton invested in a new sewer mainline extension in 2014.

Figure 13. Puget Sound Industrial Center – Bremerton UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Puget Sound Industrial Center - Bremerton UGA

The Puget Sound Industrial Center Bremerton (PSIC) UGA (shown in Figure 13) is located along SR 3 southwest of the Gorst UGA in the southern portion of the County. It is approximately 3,726 acres. The PSIC UGA is a major manufacturing center and is designated a “Regional Manufacturing/Industrial Center Suburban City” by Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). The PSIC UGA is associated with the City of Bremerton. With the Bremerton National Airport and other Port of Bremerton facilities within this UGA, future planning for the area is very important to the county and City’s long and short-term economic diversification.

Since 2008, the City of Bremerton has annexed a majority of the UGA, leaving isolated pockets, including one “island,” unincorporated. Through future annexations, it is expected that the remainder will become part of the City over the next 20 years. The Port of Bremerton has executed an interlocal agreement with the City of Port Orchard for sewer and other services. Both the cities of Bremerton and Port Orchard provide water service.



Figure 14. Port Orchard UGA Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Port Orchard UGA

The Port Orchard UGA (shown in Figure 14) includes several separate areas adjacent to the City of Port Orchard. Almost all of the area is to the east of the City and continues along Mile Hill Drive and Bethel Road. The UGA also includes two small pockets of unincorporated area adjacent to City boundaries in the western Port Orchard area. The UGA totals approximately 3,113 acres. The character of the majority of the UGA is suburban, with suburban style commercial centers along the arterial corridors of Mile Hill Drive and Bethel Road, and primarily single-family residential development in other areas. The portion of the UGA northeast of the City offers views of Sinclair Inlet. One pocket of the UGA located west of the City along Sidney Road Southwest is commercial, and the other west of the City is low density residential. Since 2006, the City has annexed a large portion of the commercial corridors within the UGA, including the Bethel Corridor annexation in April 2012.

The Port Orchard UGA was associated with the City of Port Orchard with the 1998 Comprehensive Plan adoption. Since then, the City has been gradually annexing this UGA, such efforts are expected to continue over the next 20 years.

CENTERS

Centers are a critical part of Kitsap County's planning efforts and growth strategy. At the regional level, PSRC identifies 29 Regional Growth Centers, which include two in Kitsap County: Silverdale and Bremerton. Ten regional manufacturing/industrial centers are designated, which includes Puget Sound Industrial Center - Bremerton in Kitsap County. Kitsap County also identifies two Countywide Centers: Kingston and McWilliams (located in Central Kitsap UGA).

Regional Growth Centers – Urban

Regional Growth Centers are locations of more compact, pedestrian-oriented development with a mix of housing, jobs, retail, services, and other destinations. Centers receive a significant share of the region's population and employment growth compared with other parts of the urban areas while providing improved access and mobility – especially for walking, biking, and transit.

Regional Growth Centers – Urban are designated by PSRC and must meet minimum criteria as outlined in PSRC's Regional Centers Framework including:

- An existing density of at least 18 activity units per acre, with a target of 45 activity units per acre. An activity unit is equal to either one job or one resident.
- 200 acres minimum – 640 acres maximum
- Frequent transit service
- Market potential to support growth



- Silverdale Regional Growth Center** – First designated in 2003, Silverdale (shown in Figure 15) is the only Regional Center that is unincorporated. It is 717 acres in size, bordered by Dyes Inlet to the South, HWY 3 to the West, and HWY 303 to the east. Silverdale Regional Center has its own Subarea Plan with this Comprehensive Plan, which envisions the area evolving from its current development patterns of large blocks and auto-oriented commercial to a vibrant mixed-use center with a diversity of housing and employment opportunities and greater multi-modal transportation connections. Over the next 20 years, Silverdale Regional Center is expected to accommodate much of the population and employment growth for the County.


Figure 15. Silverdale Regional Center Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Countywide Growth Centers Like Regional Growth Centers, Countywide Growth Centers include criteria for designation, however the criteria vary by County and PSRC does not play a role in their review or certification. Countywide Centers serve important roles as places for concentrating jobs, housing, shopping, and recreation opportunities. These are areas linked by transit, provide a mix of housing and services, and serve as focal points for local and county investment.


- Kingston Countywide Center** – Totalling 192 acres in size, Kingston Countywide Center (shown in Figure 16) is a subarea of the larger Kingston Urban Growth Area and includes three distinct Design Districts: Old Town, Lindvog Commercial, and Village Green. Developed with the guidance of the Kingston Community Advisory Council, the Kingston Subarea Plan includes goals and policies that guide the development and growth of the Center while preserving Kingston’s unique character.

Figure 16. Kingston Countywide Center Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



- McWilliams Countywide Center** - Totalling 162 acres in size, McWilliams Countywide Center (shown in Figure 17) is a subarea of the larger Central Kitsap Urban Growth Area and is located equal distance from Bremerton to the south, and Silverdale to the northwest. The subarea is bisected by HWY 303 and served readily by transit. It will be a key area for housing and employment growth as well as transportation investments.

Figure 17. McWilliams Countywide Center Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative




Manufacturing/Industrial Centers

Manufacturing/Industrial Centers preserve lands for family-wage jobs in basic industries and trade and provide areas where employment may grow in the future. Manufacturing/Industrial Centers form a critical regional resource that provides economic diversity, supports national and international trade, generates substantial revenue, and offers higher than average wages.

- Puget Sound Industrial Center (PSIC) – Bremerton – PSIC – Bremerton is located in the far southwest of the County, bisected by State Route 303. A small portion of the total 3,726 acres of PSIC – Bremerton is in unincorporated Kitsap County, but the majority has been annexed by the City of Bremerton. PSIC – Bremerton is positioned to be a focus area for industrial development and jobs.

Figure 18. PSIC – Bremerton Boundary – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



URBAN AREA LAND USE GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Land Use Goal 10. UGA planning focus

Focus current and future planning on infill and redevelopment of existing Urban Growth Areas (UGAs).

Land Use Policy 10.1. Support innovative, high quality infill development and redevelopment in existing developed areas within the Urban Growth Areas.

Land Use Policy 10.2. Research and evaluate incentives to promote infill development and redevelopment.

Land Use Policy 10.3. Facilitate an integrated mix of uses and development in commercial designations.

Land Use Policy 10.4. Promote housing preservation and development in areas that are already well-served by schools, public transportation, and commercial facilities and which have adequate infrastructure to support alternative modes of transportation.

Land Use Policy 10.5. Support compact forms of development in commercial areas in order to encourage pedestrian and non-motorized travel and transit use and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMT).

Land Use Policy 10.6. Measure, adopt, and implement reasonable measures if the Buildable Lands Report (BLR) finds inconsistencies in planned growth.

Land Use Policy 10.7. Accommodate affordability and flexibility in multifamily development through generous provisions for building height and density, reduced setback requirements, and encouragement of mixed attached housing types.

Land Use Strategy 10.a. Establish specific development regulations for transitioning between zones with different intensities that balance compatibility with development opportunities.

How does this relate to the preferred alternative?

The Preferred Alternative as selected by the Board of County Commissioners is based on Alternative 2 studied in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). Alternative 2 (and the Preferred Alternative) emphasize compact growth with limited changes to UGA boundaries and densification and intensification within existing UGAs and centers. This implements Growth Management Act and Regional Growth Strategy requirements to focus growth in UGAs and limit UGA expansions.



Land Use Strategy 10.b. Continue to review and assess data for application of reasonable measures. Monitor the effectiveness of adopted reasonable measures in one-year intervals with the publication of the Buildable Lands Report.

Land Use Strategy 10.c. Adopt site design standards that emphasize pedestrian-oriented forms of development, particularly in key areas where storefront environments and a mix of uses is desired.

Land Use Strategy 10.d. Review and adjust dimensional and density standards within urban zones to accommodate a variety of housing types and site layouts.

Land Use Strategy 10.e. If made available to Kitsap County, adopt the Multi-Family Tax Exemption to incentivize dense residential development in urban centers.

Land Use Goal 11. Quality of life

Enhance the character and quality of life in UGAs.

Land Use Policy 11.1. Review and update site design standards for all new residential, commercial, and mixed-use development in UGAs to ensure that:

- Developments are coordinated and connected, where possible.
- Streetscapes are safe, welcoming, and attractive.
- Sites, including buildings, circulation, parking, and open space, are thoughtfully laid out to enhance the character of streetscapes, create a safe and convenient circulation system, and enhance the function and livability of developments.
- Developments integrate useable open space that provides recreational and social engagement opportunities while enhancing the setting for land uses.
- Developments integrate trees and landscaping elements to enhance the streetscape character, provide environmental benefits, screen unwanted views, and create comfortable human environments.

Land Use Policy 11.2. Provide for publicly accessible services and amenities to serve residents, employees, shoppers, and other visitors of UGAs, including:

- Schools and other educational facilities.
- A connected network of trails.
- Parks and open space.
- Recreational facilities.
- Cultural facilities.



Land Use Policy 11.3. Ensure quality design in development of housing, businesses, and public amenities.

Land Use Strategy 11.a. Update development regulations to meet the design objectives of Land Use Policy 11.1.

Land Use Strategy 11.b. Update the County's Capital Improvement Plan to prioritize those public improvements and amenities in locations intended for mixed use and the highest development intensities.

Land Use Strategy 11.c. Explore options and opportunities for public-private partnerships that leverage strategic investment with developments that meet community design objectives.

Land Use Goal 12. Coordinating land use and transportation

Facilitate a coordinated land use and transportation pattern that reduces the reliance on the Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV).

Land Use Policy 12.1. Support higher density residential uses in areas with access to multi-modal transportation, urban amenities, goods and services, physical activity, and healthy foods.

Land Use Policy 12.2. Promote commercial, mixed use, high density housing, and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to promote walking, rolling, and transit use, while reducing SOV trips and reducing per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Land Use Policy 12.3. Update development and design standards to promote good circulation and help reduce SOV trips.

Land Use Policy 12.4. Restrict the number of drive-through businesses in areas designated for high pedestrian activity.

Land Use Strategy 12.a. Update zoning provisions coordinated with transit access, commercial services, and public amenities.

Land Use Strategy 12.b. Adopt minimum density requirements in strategic areas to ensure that development is supportive of transit use.

Land Use Strategy 12.c. Adopt block size standards and intervals for required through-block connections in commercial, mixed-use, and multifamily-zoned areas.

Land Use Goal 13. Encourage urban-rural distinction

Encourage an urban-rural distinction and coordinate growth with cities

Land Use Policy 13.1. Facilitate and encourage urban areas to annex to associated cities or incorporate over the 20-year planning period and ensure compatibility of development with future planned uses.

Land Use Policy 13.2. In accordance with Kitsap Public Health District and Washington State requirements, require connection to a public sewer system for new or extensively remodeled development located within 200 feet of the public sewer system and within an urban growth area.

Land Use Policy 13.3. Address the issues related to the association of unincorporated Urban Growth Areas with their corresponding incorporated cities, consistent with the CPPs.

Land Use Policy 13.4. Enter into discussions with jurisdictions having any newly incorporated areas to address the logical transfer of jurisdiction, including the issues of infrastructure provision, ownership, and maintenance; revenue sharing; and regional planning.

Land Use Strategy 13.a. Establish a planning process to improve consistency between city and County plans, zoning, and development regulations in associated UGAs to further efficient delivery of urban services.

Land Use Strategy 13.b. Work with sewer purveyors to plan and provide for infrastructure in designated Urban Growth Areas, including small community sewer systems.

Land Use Strategy 13.c. Associate the Central Kitsap UGA with the City of Bremerton.

Land Use Goal 14. Direct development to UGAs

Direct development to designated Urban Growth Areas consistent with projected population growth, Growth Management Act, VISION 2050, and the Countywide Planning Policies.

Land Use Policy 14.1 Consider development patterns that reduce sprawl, use urban land more efficiently, and incorporate feasible, innovative, and sustainable practices.

Land Use Policy 14.2. Ensure consistency between the assumptions contained in the County's Land Capacity Analysis and Countywide Planning Policies.

Land Use Policy 14.3. Through application of Growth Management Act goals and adopted incentives, increase density in urban areas and limit sprawl in rural areas.

Land Use Policy 14.4. Maintain consistency with Countywide Planning Policies regarding growth targeting.

Land Use Policy 14.5. Explore the creation of incentives and streamlined administrative processes for new short plats in high priority areas to be identified within the Urban Growth Areas as a reasonable measure.

Land Use Strategy 14.a. At the five-year mid-point of Comprehensive Plan cycle, consider assessing the Land Use Map and docket for Site Specific Amendments.

Land Use Strategy 14.b. At the five-year mid-point of the Comprehensive Plan cycle, evaluate the effectiveness of development regulations.



Land Use Strategy 14.c. Create and use dashboards with permit and census data to review trends in permit activity, new housing units, and demographics such as health indicators.

Land Use Goal 15. Provide sufficient industrial lands

Maintain sufficient industrial land area in the Urban Growth Areas for future industrial use.

Land Use Policy 15.1. When updating code pertaining to industrial lands, ensure that industrial uses are a priority in order to prevent commercial encroachment.

Land Use Policy 15.2. Apply the Urban Industrial designation in areas most conducive to industrial development, e.g., few or no natural limitations to development, reasonable accessibility to major streets and highways, available services and facilities, and compatibility with adjacent land uses.

Land Use Strategy 15.a. Focus the locations of industrial zoning consistent with Department of Commerce and Puget Sound Regional Council guidance.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

RURAL AREA BACKGROUND

The Growth Management Act requires that Counties include a rural element that addresses lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. The rural element is focused on ensuring land uses are compatible with the rural character of such lands and provides for a variety of rural densities and uses.

While managing growth, Kitsap County recognizes that rural character is a factor in drawing residents. Defining this character is an important step in preserving it. Kitsap County's rural area consists of differing natural features, landscape types, and land uses. Rural land uses consist of both dispersed and clustered residential developments, farms, wooded lots, and small and moderate-scale commercial and industrial uses that serve rural residents as their primary client. Rural landscapes encompass a full range of natural features including forested expanses, rolling meadows, streams and lakes, pastures and cropland, shorelines, and other sensitive areas.

The rural area of Kitsap County is much less developed than the urban areas. This allows for and encourages the natural landscape to predominate over the built environment. The most density Kitsap County allows in the rural areas is one dwelling unit per five acres (Rural Residential zone). This zoning allows for large amounts of land to remain undeveloped and for the protection of critical areas and rural character. The County has adopted a Critical Areas Ordinance which protects wetlands, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, geologically hazardous areas, frequently flooded areas, and critical aquifer recharge areas from the impacts of development and people from the consequences of developing in unsuitable areas. The County has also adopted an ordinance for its Shoreline Master Program which protects shorelines based on preferred and existing patterns of development. Kitsap County has adopted five comprehensive plan designations and five implementing zoning classifications in the rural areas that are intended to prevent the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land. Further, the provision of urban level of governmental services to the rural area is restricted.




Photo credit: Kitsap County

For County residents, the term rural also defines a philosophy of living and a quality of life. This quality of life includes a sense of quiet, community, and a slower pace of life. Rural characteristics include the abundance of trees, access to recreation, views of water and mountains, and a quiet, unregimented atmosphere. The elements of rural character also include the dynamic natural systems abundant in Kitsap County which can be vulnerable to human and natural change. Rural goals and policies also recognize that rural areas and communities have unique historical characters, appearances, and functions that should be retained and enhanced.



RURAL DESIGNATIONS

Table 7. Kitsap County's Rural Land Use Designations

Rural Residential
<p>This designation promotes low-density residential development and agricultural activities that are consistent with rural character. It is applied to areas that are relatively unconstrained by environmentally sensitive areas or other significant landscape features. These areas are provided with limited public services. Maximum density is 1 dwelling unit per 5 acres. The implementing zone is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Residential (86,082 acres)
Rural Protection
<p>This designation promotes low-density rural development and agricultural activities that are consistent with rural character and protects environmental features such as significant visual, historical, and natural features, wildlife corridors, steep slopes, wetlands, streams, and adjacent critical areas. Maximum density is 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres. The implementing zone is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Protection (30,903 acres)
Rural Wooded
<p>This designation is intended to encourage the preservation of forest uses and agricultural activities, retain rural character, and conserve natural resources while providing for some rural residential use. This zone is further intended to discourage activities and facilities that can be considered detrimental to the maintenance of timber production. Residents of rural wooded (RW) residential tracts shall recognize that they can be subject to normal and accepted farming and forestry practices on adjacent parcels. Maximum density is 1 dwelling unit per 20 acres. The implementing zone is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Wooded (43,077 acres)
Rural Commercial
<p>This designation is intended to permit the location of small-scale commercial retail businesses and personal services which serve a limited area of the rural population outside established UGAs. Appropriate uses are small-scale retail, sales, and services located along county roads on small parcels that serve the nearby rural residential population. This designation may be located at crossroads of county roads, state routes, and major arterials. The implementing zone is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Commercial (257 acres)
Rural Industrial
<p>This designation provides for small-scale light industrial, light manufacturing, recycling, mineral processing, and resource-based goods production uses that are compatible with rural character and do not require an urban level of utilities and services. The implementing zone is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural Industrial (157 acres)

LAMIRDS

Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development, or LAMIRDs, are allowed for the purpose of recognizing existing areas of more intense or dense rural development and to contain these areas from sprawling.

- Type 1 LAMIRDs have a variety of uses characterized as a village or hamlet.
- Type 2 LAMIRDs are for recreation purposes only. Kitsap County does not have any Type 2 LAMIRDs.
- Type 3 LAMIRDs are for small-scale businesses and cottage industries that provide job opportunities for rural residents.

LAMIRDs may be served by public facilities and services that are appropriate and necessary for the amount of development contained within the boundaries.

LAMIRD Maps can be found in the subarea plan elements later in this draft. Maps for all LAMIRDs will be forthcoming in this section in the final draft of the Comp Plan.

Type 1 Rural Village/Rural Commercial.

The only type of LAMIRD designated in Kitsap County prior to 2010, this designation is characterized as infill development or redevelopment of existing commercial, industrial, residential, or mixed-use areas, whether as shoreline development, villages, hamlets, rural activity centers, or crossroads. Any development or redevelopment other than an industrial area or use within a Type 1 LAMIRD must be principally designed to serve the rural population.

Any new development or redevelopment must be consistent with the pre-existing character of the area with respect to building size, scale, use, or intensity. Type 1 LAMIRDs must have been established as more densely developed areas as of July 1990, and they must include pre-GMA existing development. Type 1 LAMIRDs also must be bounded by a “logical outer boundary” that reflects the limits of the pre-existing development.

- **Manchester** is Kitsap County’s largest LAMIRD, encompassing approximately 1,133 acres of land with a clear view across Puget Sound to West Seattle and housing approximately 5,200 residents across 2,310 tax parcels. Manchester was designated a LAMIRD on June 10, 2001. It is located in southern Kitsap County east of the City of Port Orchard and consists of a small variety of commercial businesses and services, the Manchester Library, the Manchester Post Office, two public docks, single-family residences, and a handful of multifamily residences. Public water is provided by the Manchester Water District and sewer by the Kitsap County Sewer Utility. However, a number of very small lots are still using on-site septic systems.
- **Suquamish** is a rural, historic waterfront community within the Port Madison Indian Reservation located in northern Kitsap County east of the City of Poulsbo along the western shore of Port Madison Bay. The LAMIRD was designated on April 21, 1999. There are approximately 470 acres of land divided into 1242 parcels with a population of about 2,725.




The Suquamish LAMIRD consists primarily of single-family homes, a few small businesses, open space, and parklands. Public water is provided by the Kitsap Public Utility District and sewer by the Kitsap County Sewer Utility.

- **Keyport** is a small historic waterfront community that has long supported naval operations in the adjacent Naval Underseas Warfare Center – Keyport on the small peninsula that extends into Liberty Bay south of Poulsbo. Keyport was designated as a LAMIRD on November 19, 2007. There are 80 acres split into 202 tax parcels with 402 residents, a few small businesses and restaurants, the Naval Undersea Museum, and open space. Public water is provided by Kitsap Public Utility District and sewer service by the Kitsap County Sewer Utility, though a number of small lots are still served by on-site septic systems.
- **Port Gamble** was founded as a company timber town in 1843, designated a LAMIRD on July 21, 1999, and remains owned solely by one entity. Currently, almost all of the buildings are more than 100 years old and include a post office, a few small businesses, and a number of single-family homes. These structures are on about 127 acres split into 18 parcels and house about 80 people. The former lumber mill site is planned for major redevelopment that was approved as part of a Development Agreement in 2021. Kitsap Public Utility District provides water service and oversees sewer treatment. Sewer conveyance is provided by Rayonier, the site owner.
- **George’s Corner** is a small commercial center at the crossroads of State Highway 104 and Miller Bay Road/Hansville Road west of Kingston. A number of vehicle-oriented businesses are on the site which is 25 parcels on about 42 acres served by public water from the Kitsap Public Utilities District and on-site septic systems. George’s Corner was designated as a LAMIRD on October 25, 2004.

Type 3 Employment Centers. These LAMIRDs are meant for the intensification of or new development of lots for isolated cottage industries and isolated small-scale businesses. Residential development is prohibited. Type 3 LAMIRDs need not principally serve the rural population but should provide job opportunities for rural residents. Expansion or new development must conform with the rural character of the area. Public services and public facilities must be limited to those that are the minimum necessary to serve the industry or business.

- **Ecology Road** is the northernmost Type 3 LAMIRD, located on the west side of the intersection of Hansville Road and Ecology Road. There are several contractors, suppliers of firewood, topsoil, and propane, and storage units at this site. This area was designated a LAMIRD on December 15, 2010, and has 18 parcels across about 64 acres. Kitsap Public Utility District provides water service and the site is served by on-site septic systems.
- **Streibels Corner** encompasses properties near the intersection of Highways 307 and 104 and bounded by Minder Road on the south. Several autobody shops are located in this LAMIRD, as well as a number of contractors and a business park. Streibels Corner was designated as a LAMIRD on December 15, 2010, and has about 160 acres, 73 parcels, and about 35 residents. Kitsap Public Utility District provides water service to the site, and it is served by on-site septic systems.
- **Twelve Trees** is located generally southwest of the intersection of Pioneer Way and Highway 3 directly north of Poulsbo. Twelve Trees is an industrial park location including warehouses that houses a variety of manufacturing businesses on about 114 acres and 50 parcels. This LAMIRD was designated on December 15, 2010. Kitsap Public Utility District provides water service, and the site is served by on-site septic systems.
- **Bond/Gunderson** LAMIRD is located in North Kitsap at the intersection of Bond Road and Gunderson Road. It is about 64 acres on 11 lots with office buildings that house contractors and food production. This is also the site of an in-progress Kitsap County Public Works Service Center. This LAMIRD was designated on December 15, 2010. Kitsap Public Utility District provides water service, and the site is served by on-site septic systems.
- **Port Orchard Airport** is located on Sidney Road near the Pierce County line. The LAMIRD is composed entirely of the airport site, including hangars and an approximately 2,300-foot-long runway for small aircraft. The LAMIRD is 116 acres in 36 parcels and was designated on June 30, 2016. The site is served by public water.

Figure 20. Map of Type III Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development



RURAL LAND USE GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Land Use Goal 16. Rural character

Protect Kitsap County's unique rural character.

Land Use Policy 16.1. Permit residential uses in rural areas in a variety of rural lot sizes consistent with the rural character of the surrounding area.

Land Use Policy 16.2. Maintain LAMIRDs at low residential densities that can be sustained by minimal infrastructure improvements, minimize environmental degradation, and that will not cumulatively create the future necessity or expectation of urban levels of service.



Land Use Policy 16.3. Allow infill and redevelopment within LAMIRD boundaries consistent with the character of the existing LAMIRD in terms of building size, scale, use, and intensity and that does not increase the need for public facilities and utilities to urban levels.

Land Use Policy 16.4. Accommodate appropriate rural uses not characterized by urban growth.

Land Use Policy 16.5. Allow for essential public facilities, other regional infrastructure, and rural governmental services.

Land Use Policy 16.6. Consistent also with Land Use Goal 14- Direct development to UGAs, limit rural growth rates by focusing growth with the Urban Growth Areas.

Land Use Strategy 16.a. Review and revise as necessary standards and development regulations for the rural area to preserve rural character.

Land Use Strategy 16.b. Explore development regulations that minimize changes in grade from pre-development site conditions in order to maximize native vegetation retention.

Land Use Strategy 16.c. Review development regulations including lot size and density for LAMIRDs and update as necessary to allow for appropriate infill.

Land Use Strategy 16.d. Continuously review and revise as necessary development regulations regarding clustering, density transfer, design guidelines, conservation easements and other innovative land use techniques to ensure they are working as intended.

Land Use Strategy 16.e. Explore regulation and incentive programs to improve compatibility between diverse rural uses (e.g. small-scale agriculture, rural businesses, and residences).

Land Use Goal 17. Foster rural business

Foster rural businesses and business opportunities on designated commercial and industrial lands in the rural area while balancing the protection of rural character.

Land Use Policy 17.1. Encourage business growth in existing LAMIRDs while limiting business growth outside of LAMIRDs.

Land Use Policy 17.2. Allow or conditionally allow home-based cottage-type businesses and industries in the rural areas that do not negatively affect rural level of service or rural character.

Land Use Policy 17.3. When considering public spending for facilities and services within the rural area, prioritize the maintenance of existing facilities and services that protect public health and safety and only upgrade facilities and services to provide rural service levels without creating capacity for urban growth.



Land Use Strategy 17.a. Review and amend development regulations to reduce barriers to rural businesses that protect rural character.

Land Use Goal 18. Support farming and agriculture

Maintain and enhance the viability of agricultural uses and activities in rural areas, including cultivation, animal husbandry, and value-added production.

Land Use Policy 18.1. Foster agriculture opportunities by promoting flexibility in development regulations.

Land Use Policy 18.2. Continue regulatory and non-regulatory preservation of historic or working farmland.

Land Use Policy 18.3. The Kitsap County Agricultural Strategic Plan and Inventory shall be the basis for discussions of Kitsap's food system, including agriculture, policies, and programs developed by the County. Agricultural mapping detailed in the Plan shall be maintained and refined.

Land Use Policy 18.4. Coordinate with federal, state, and local governments, community groups, and private landowners to promote long-term preservation of farmlands.

Land Use Policy 18.5. Recognize and value water as an agricultural necessity.



Land Use Strategy 18.a. Develop and adopt policies with appropriate local, county, and state agencies to promote viable coordinated water resources for greater accessibility to water rights for agriculture usage.

Land Use Strategy 18.b. Review and amend development regulations to consider impacts of non-farm-related commercial or industrial uses to the Farming Areas identified in the Agricultural Strategic Plan and Inventory.

Land Use Strategy 18.c. Encourage preservation of historic or working farm land through strategies including tax policy, conservation easements, Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), Purchase of Development Rights (PDR), innovative design criteria, expedited agricultural activity permit review program, educational and agritourism activities, and the establishment of a small farms institute.

Land Use Strategy 18.d. Form an agricultural advisory committee to inform development of future regulations and act as a resource to farmers regarding incentive and other assistance programs.

Land Use Strategy 18.e. Review Kitsap's agricultural land uses, businesses, and products against the criteria for agricultural resource lands and evaluate future designation.

RESOURCE LANDS BACKGROUND

RCW 36.70A.170 requires counties to designate resource lands in their comprehensive plans. Resource lands are required to have long-term commercial significance for the region, including intense capacity and productivity. For this reason, although some agricultural activity does occur in Kitsap County, the county's agricultural land lacks the capacity for long-term commercial significance. Therefore, Kitsap County does not designate any agricultural resource lands. Forestlands and mineral resource lands are designated.

Kitsap County uses the same general criteria for designating resource lands as are outlined in WAC 365-190-050 through 365-190-070. These are lands not characterized by urban growth. There are some soils in North Kitsap that are of statewide significance based on soil type but are in general on small lots or are used for timber production and therefore not eligible to be designated as agricultural resource lands. The designated Forest Resource Lands in Kitsap County are in Green Mountain State Forest and managed by Washington State Department of Natural Resources as working forest lands. Mineral resource lands are designated based on the known or highly probable presence of aggregate and sand. Most resource extraction sites are in central Kitsap; smaller extraction sites exist elsewhere in Kitsap County.

The intent of resource lands goals and policies is to direct the use of lands that contain commercial quality resources. These resource-based uses are often intermixed or occur together with residential development within the County's rural areas. This designation of resource lands and activities is intended to help keep these lands available for commercially significant resource production and to help maintain these sectors of the local economy. Resource lands are identified on the Land Use Map with the Forest Resource designation or Mineral Resource Overlay. The Forest Resource designation primarily is assigned to lands that have commercial forestry resources. The Forest Resource designation is implemented by the Forest Resource zone. The Mineral Resource Overlay is primarily assigned to lands that have known or likely mineral resources such as gravel or sand.



RESOURCE LANDS DESIGNATIONS

Table 8. Kitsap County’s Resource Lands Land Use Designations

Forest Resource Lands:
<p>This designation primarily focuses on lands that have commercial forestry resources. These lands are typically large parcels, are not near concentrated rural populations, and are in active forestry production.</p> <p>The implementing zone of the same name has the following description: The primary land use allowed in this zone is commercial timber production and harvesting. This zone is further intended to discourage activities and facilities which can be considered detrimental to the production and commercial harvest of timber. Residents located within or adjacent to the Forest Resource Lands zone shall recognize that they can be subject to normal and accepted forestry practices on parcels located within this zone. There are 2,630 acres in Forest Resource Land zoning.</p>
Mineral Resource Lands:
<p>This designation primarily focuses on lands where the extraction of minerals occurs or can be anticipated to occur based upon maps provided by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources, as well as where accessory uses (e.g., rock crushing, batch plants) may occur.</p> <p>The description for the Mineral Resource Overlay (additional provisions on top of the underlying zone) is: The intent of this overlay is to protect and enhance significant sand, gravel and rock deposits as identified mineral resource lands. It is also used to ensure the continued or future use without disrupting or endangering adjacent land uses, while safeguarding life, property, and the public welfare. Provisions of state statutes applicable to Kitsap County pertaining to surface mining are hereby adopted by reference. The Mineral Resource Overlay applies to 2,716 acres.</p>

RESOURCE LANDS GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Land Use Goal 19. Maintain forest resource lands

Maintain forest resource lands in Kitsap County for continued forestry production.

Land Use Policy 19.1. Account for the continued use of properties managed for timber production and compatibility of these properties with surrounding lands.

Land Use Policy 19.2. Coordinate with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Tribal governments, community groups, and private forest landowners to promote long-term preservation of forest lands.

Land Use Policy 19.3. Allow industrial uses associated with forestry activities in the Mineral Resource Overlay zone.

Land Use Policy 19.4. Allow the use of industry-standard Best Management Practices within designated Forest Resource Lands and the Rural Wooded designation, provided all applicable environmental laws and regulations are followed.

Land Use Strategy 19.a. Maintain and enhance the continuation of forestry lands and forestry through tax policy, conservation easements, purchase of development rights, Transfer of Development Rights (TDR), and clustering incentives.

Land Use Strategy 19.b. Develop, implement, evaluate, and restructure, if necessary, the existing Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.

Land Use Strategy 19.c. Require that all plats, short plats, development permits, and building permits issued for development activities on, or within eight hundred feet of, lands designated as forest resource lands contain a notice to title that the subject property is within or near designated forest resource lands on which a variety of commercial activities may occur that are not compatible with residential development for certain periods of limited duration.

Land Use Strategy 19.d. Develop and promote incentives for continued rural and resource uses and preservation.

What is Transfer of Development Rights?

Transfer of Development Rights, or TDR, is a planning tool used to incentivize protection sensitive areas (like critical areas or forest resource lands). In a TDR program, the County designates sensitive areas or natural resources as “sending” areas and other areas as “receiving” areas. The development rights associated with the sending areas can be “transferred” to the receiving areas, which get a development density or intensity bonus to enable them to use those development rights.



Land Use Goal 20. Mineral resource lands

Assess and maintain mineral resource lands in Kitsap County for continued mineral production.

Land Use Policy 20.1. Acknowledge new or updated mineral resource deposit locations in future revisions to zoning and development regulations in urban or rural areas.

Land Use Policy 20.2. Account for the continued use of properties for mineral extraction and associated activities and compatibility of these properties with surrounding lands.

Land Use Policy 20.3. Require that all plats, short plats, development permits, and building permits issued for development activities on, or within eight hundred feet of, lands designated as mineral resource lands, contain a notice to title that the subject property is within or near designated mineral resource lands on which a variety of commercial activities may occur that are not compatible with residential development for certain periods of limited duration. The notice for mineral resource lands shall also inform that an application might be made for mining-related activities, including mining, extraction, washing, crushing, stockpiling, blasting, transporting, and recycling of minerals.



Land Use Strategy 20.a. Review and revise as necessary Mineral Resource designations using new or updated Washington State Department of Natural Resources permit or other data sources.

Land Use Strategy 20.b. Coordinate with the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (DNR) to ensure that future reclamation plans are consistent with the comprehensive planning for the site and surrounding area, as well as any permits issued by the Department of Natural Resources.

Land Use Strategy 20.c. Determine whether adequate mineral resources are available for projected needs from currently designated mineral resource lands.

REFERENCES

- [Vision 2050](#), PSRC
- [Multi-County Planning Policies](#)
- [Countywide Planning Policies](#)
- Joint Land Use Study (2015)
- [Buildable Lands Report](#) (2021)
- [Kitsap County Agriculture Strategic Plan](#)



ST. MICHAEL MEDICAL CENTER, SILVERDALE, WA

CHAPTER 2

Economic Development

Chapter 2 / **Economic Development** **Element**

VISION

As part of the Greater Seattle market, Kitsap County has a place in one of the most diverse, innovative, and competitive regional economies in the world. While an integral part of the regional economy, Kitsap County also has a local economy all its own, especially given its natural separation from Seattle by water.

Kitsap County uses land use planning, efficient regulatory processes, solid infrastructure, and environmental protections to maintain a high quality of life that attracts desired businesses, providing for a prosperous and diversified economy with living-wage jobs for residents. Kitsap County takes advantage of its abundant natural beauty, miles of shoreline and many acres of forest lands as assets that contribute to the scenic beauty of the area and to its economic value as they attract tourists.

INTENT

The Economic Development element aims to encourage economic development in Kitsap County that considers the regional economic context and is suited to the unique conditions of the county. The element is designed to build capacity and guide the economic prosperity and resiliency of Kitsap County. The Economic Development goals, policies, and strategies provide the framework to improve and sustain Kitsap County's fiscal, economic, and social conditions utilizing local resources, partnerships, and economic opportunities.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Growth Management Act (GMA) sets forth planning goals to guide the development of comprehensive plans. The following GMA planning goal directly addresses economic development:

Encourage economic development throughout the state that is consistent with adopted comprehensive plans, promote economic opportunity for all citizens of this state, especially for unemployed and for disadvantaged persons, promote the retention and expansion of existing businesses and recruitment of new businesses, recognize regional differences impacting economic development opportunities, and encourage growth in areas experiencing insufficient economic growth, all within the capacities of the state's natural resources, public services, and public facilities.

In support of this planning goal, the GMA requires that a comprehensive plan have an economic development element. The economic development element is to include provisions for "economic growth and vitality and a high quality of life."



The central Puget Sound region is comprised of four counties: Snohomish, King, Pierce, and Kitsap. Collaboratively, these counties and entities within them are charged with jointly planning for the transportation, land use, and economic development needs of the region through the Puget Sound Regional Council. VISION 2050 is the region's current plan for growth.



VISION 2050 carries forward many of the economic policies from the prior plan (Vision 2040); however, the following economic policy areas were expanded or added to when it was updated in 2020:

- Retention and recruitment of locally, women-, and minority-owned small businesses and start-ups and established and emerging industries, technologies, and services that promote environmental sustainability
- Strategies to expand access to opportunity
- Strategies to address and prevent commercial displacement
- Promotion of environmental and socially responsible business practices that address climate change and improve health outcomes
- Recognition of the contributions of the region's culturally and ethnically diverse communities, institutions, and Native Tribes

The Kitsap Countywide Planning Polices, which inform the development of comprehensive plans for jurisdictions in the county, have been updated to be consistent with the GMA and VISION 2050.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

Economic Development goals, policies, and strategies in Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan are interconnected to the strength, structure, and implementation of other comprehensive plan elements including Land Use, Housing, Transportation, Capital Facilities, Parks, Recreation and Open Space, Climate Change, and Environment. For example, the Land Use element ensures an adequate amount of land is appropriately zoned to accommodate a variety of employment opportunities. And the Housing element plans for affordable housing options for the workforce to live near employment centers.

BACKGROUND

Kitsap is a recognized leader in several key economic sectors: defense; advanced manufacturing (maritime and aerospace); technology (information and communication technology, e-commerce, cyber security, and clean tech); health care; business services; specialty foods; and tourism. Overall, the defense sector accounts for nearly half of Kitsap’s economic output and workforce. Kitsap provides strong support of Naval Base Kitsap and its diverse missions. As a result, our local economy ranks high within the Region in several essential economic development indicators: workforce educational attainment; engineering talent; development of intellectual property; per capita economic output; employment levels; and median household incomes.

The two strongest factors that impact Kitsap’s economy are regional effects from Greater Seattle and localized effects from Naval Base Kitsap. The former is one of the nation’s most vibrant economies. The latter has an annual economic impact in the region of more than \$4 billion, with billions more forecast for investment and modernization of installations through 2038.

Kitsap also has a “homegrown” private sector that headquarters a small set of firms here with a footprint beyond our borders: SAFE Boats International, Watson Furniture, Farbank, and Town and Country Markets are all examples of companies that either started in Kitsap or saw significant growth here. The largest private employer in the community is St. Michael Medical Center, while our community’s tribal corporations, Port Madison Enterprises and Noo-Kayet Investments, are also among the top private employers. For a more diverse economic future, private sector industries currently showing promise to mature into larger clusters include maritime, health care, and tourism.

Post-pandemic, the cost of living in Kitsap generally resembles the rest of Puget Sound. Our Bremerton-Silverdale-Port Orchard metro area costs are generally the same as Tacoma, Bellingham, and Olympia. In some cases, it is slightly more expensive here. All these cities remain more affordable than Seattle. Other data points to a rise in Kitsap’s income and costs, such as weekly wage growth (12.7% in Kitsap, second highest in the nation, from Q3 2021-2022) and median home prices (which increased by 38.1% from March 2020 to 2022).

More than half of Kitsap County residents are cost-burdened, spending more than a third of their income on housing. Affordable housing is difficult to attain in the community. The median cost of a home in Kitsap, excluding Bainbridge Island, is more than \$500,000. Meanwhile, a new garden-style one-bedroom apartment in Kitsap, regardless of location, starts at around \$1,700 a month.

Kitsap is growing and on track to achieve or exceed its population targets. Drivers behind population increases are not only our community’s relative affordability to Seattle, but the changes in business and personal lives driven by the COVID pandemic, from the rise of remote work to the attractiveness of having a home in a more rural area or otherwise placing a greater value upon quality of life. Another contributing factor making Kitsap attractive to talent is the rise of Kitsap Transit’s fast ferry fleet.



KEY TERMS

BIPOC – Refers to Black, Indigenous, and People of Color. Often used to refer to members of nonwhite communities.

Displacement – Occurs when residents can no longer afford to remain in their homes due to rising housing costs. Causes can include limited availability of housing choices for low-income residents supports and services that low-income families rely on disappearing from their neighborhood, and eviction, acquisition, rehabilitation, or demolition of property.

Economic cluster – Local concentrations of similar or complementary industries.

Equity impact analyses – An examination of any disproportionate (positive or negative) impacts affecting a particular group when compared to other groups and addressing said disparities through targeted actions. Examples of impacts are opportunities, outcomes, and representation.

High potential sector – An area poised for growth and profitability. Examples are technology, healthcare, and energy.

LGBTQIA+ - An inclusive term that encompasses people of all genders and sexualities. The acronym stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersex, asexual and other identities.

Living wage job - An income level that allows individuals or families to afford adequate shelter, food, and other necessities.

Median wage – The income amount that is directly in the middle of the income range. Half the population earns less than the median wage and the other half earns more than the median wage.

Social Determinates of Health – Nonmedical factors that influence health outcomes. These are conditions in the environment in which people are born, grow, live, learn, work, play, worship, and age that shape health. Examples of nonmedical factors include physical environment, patterns of social engagement, and one’s sense of security and well-being.

Social Equity – Refers to impartiality, fairness, and justice for all people in social policy. Considers systemic inequities that affect different groups of people and works to eliminate them.

Socioeconomic demographic – Refers to the absolute or relative levels of economic resources, power, and prestige closely associated with wealth of an individual, specific population, or community. This is a multidimensional construct comprising of such factors as income, education, and employment status.

Shoreline Master Program (SMP) – [KCC Title 22](#) Guides the future development of the shorelines in Kitsap County in a manner consistent with the Shoreline Management Act of 1971, comprised of basic state and county law regulating use of shorelines in the county.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Economic Development Goal 1. Promote economic Growth and Investments

Promote healthy economic growth and investments that support livable and resilient communities that are fueled by innovation and the diverse people and businesses of Kitsap County.

Economic Development Policy 1.1. Foster awareness of the economic development efforts in Kitsap County.

Economic Development Policy 1.2. Make necessary and encourage ambitious investments in workforce and education.

Economic Development Policy 1.3. Invest in efficient, cost-effective capital improvements and programs necessary for commerce and industry to thrive and increase the prevalence of living-wage jobs.

Economic Development Policy 1.4. Support funding as needed to maintain and grow programs that promote enhanced community economic outcomes.

Economic Development Policy 1.5. Promote the long-term strength of the local economy by retaining and further developing a skilled workforce, which attracts and retains businesses.

Economic Development Policy 1.6. Enhance economic outcomes for Kitsap's youth and families and increase participation of women in the workforce.

Economic Development Strategy 1.a. Collaborate with cities, tribal governments, Kitsap Economic Development Alliance (KEDA), ports and other local districts, and the private sector in pursuit of economic development.

Economic Development Strategy 1.b. Collectively execute effective economic development programs in business retention, expansion, and startup efforts with applicable agencies, organizations, and jurisdictions.

Economic Development Strategy 1.c. Support investments and offer incentives in the development and/or redevelopment of the Silverdale Regional Center.

Economic Development Strategy 1.d. Increase allowable density of housing within designated Urban Growth Areas (UGA) to allow for incoming growth, amplifying nearby commercial and retail environments, and improving access to services.

Economic Development Strategy 1.e. Support workforce development programs.

Economic Development Strategy 1.f. Promote access to and development of exceptional K-12, trade programs, and higher education opportunities that lead directly to career pathways (for example: apprenticeship, trade, and technical education).



Economic Development Strategy 1.g. Solicit employer feedback to determine what current and future careers are likely needed in the local workforce mix.

Economic Development Strategy 1.h. Support investments in and growth of early childhood education and childcare centers.

Economic Development Goal 2. Government operations and regulations

Foster a business-friendly climate through county government operations and regulations.

Economic Development Policy 2.1. Enact employer, investor, worker, and business-friendly policies.

Economic Development Policy 2.2. Make necessary infrastructure investments including transportation, sewer, water, electricity and broadband to accommodate Kitsap's growth, maximize opportunity, and maintain a high quality of life.

Economic Development Policy 2.3. Establish a diverse mix of commercial, industrial, and retail land uses.

Economic Development Policy 2.4. Encourage full utilization and development of industrial and commercial zoned areas.

Economic Development Policy 2.5. Promote a balance between economic growth and protection of Kitsap County's environmental assets and rural character.

Economic Development Policy 2.6. Support efforts to enhance economic, visual, and environmental qualities of rural areas.

Economic Development Strategy 2.a. Promote positive relationships with economic development stakeholders as valued members of Kitsap County through collaborative discussions of redevelopment, regulations and incentives.

Economic Development Strategy 2.b. Provide timely customer service, permitting support and resources to businesses looking to establish roots, relocate, or expand in Kitsap County.

Economic Development Strategy 2.c. Identify, avoid, and mitigate potential negative impacts to the environment due to economic growth and development.

Economic Development Strategy 2.d. Prioritize new infrastructure investments and redevelopment of existing infrastructure that is underutilized in industrial and commercial areas.

Economic Development Strategy 2.e. Focus economic development efforts in Urban Growth Areas, Commercial Districts, and Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRDs) where appropriate.

Economic Development Goal 3. Jobs and business

Prioritize living wage jobs, business formation, retention, and expansion efforts in Kitsap County.

Economic Development Policy 3.1. Support entrepreneurship and innovation.

Economic Development Policy 3.2. Promote increased broadband internet service as a necessary public utility.

Economic Development Policy 3.3. Support new business development.



Economic Development Strategy 3.a. Support programs that grow entrepreneurship through creative, programmatic, and collaborative efforts by individuals, business, and organizations.

Economic Development Strategy 3.b. Increase broadband offerings, particularly access and affordability for underserved residents.

Economic Development Strategy 3.c. Prioritize the recruitment of firms that are above median wage or that are associated with targeted economic cluster efforts.

Economic Development Strategy 3.d. Collaborate with public and private partners to accommodate the interests and needs of new businesses forming and/or that wish to locate here.

Economic Development Strategy 3.e. Seek funding for business recruitment and formation research.

Economic Development Strategy 3.f. Support educational and economic programs that prioritize and encourage the ability of our youth to maintain residency in Kitsap County.



Economic Development Goal 4. Sustainability

Focus on Kitsap's strengths in building our economy for a healthy and sustainable economic future.

Economic Development Policy 4.1. Support economic development for emerging and growing private sector industries.

Economic Development Policy 4.2. Support maritime industry growth.

Economic Development Policy 4.3. Foster economic diversification.

Economic Development Policy 4.4. Encourage appropriate economic opportunities in rural areas.

Economic Development Policy 4.5. Recognize that the health and preservation of Kitsap County's natural environment increases economic activity.



Economic Development Strategy 4.a. Provide adequate infrastructure and land for industrial uses.

Economic Development Strategy 4.b. Continue to support efforts to improve the Gorst corridor and alleviate persistent traffic congestion.

Economic Development Strategy 4.c. Bolster maritime and health care industries to become larger economic clusters.

Economic Development Strategy 4.d. Amplify strong subsectors of industry in Kitsap, including but not limited to engineering, architecture, construction, advanced manufacturing, aviation, and technology.

Economic Development Strategy 4.e. Consider climate change resiliency when supporting and investing in utilities, infrastructure, energy, and health systems.

Economic Development Strategy 4.f. Consider opportunities in new technology, talent/migration, businesses, and investment.

Economic Development Strategy 4.g. Consider opportunities for shoreline industrial uses consistent with the Shoreline Master Program (SMP).

Economic Development Goal 5. Social determinants of health and economic vitality

Acknowledge and address economic disparities experienced by residents of Kitsap County.

Economic Development Policy 5.1. Work to decrease costs of living in Kitsap County.

Economic Development Policy 5.2. Mitigate the challenges of homelessness and avoid displacement in the community.

Economic Development Policy 5.3. Encourage economic activity capable of providing living-wage jobs reasonably scaled to the needs of the community.

Economic Development Policy 5.4. Recognize that a healthy economy is a foundation of positive social, community, health, and other outcomes.

Economic Development Policy 5.5. Identify and confront barriers within the community of access to medical care.

Economic Development Policy 5.6. Expand access to affordable healthy food and the community's capacity to produce, process, and distribute local foods.

Economic Development Policy 5.7. Support food-oriented programs that will stimulate economic growth, such as agritourism, food-oriented businesses, manufacturers, and distributors.

Economic Development Strategy 5.a. Incentivize mixed-use developments, multifamily housing, and other strategies to ensure affordability in Kitsap County.

Economic Development Strategy 5.b. Support community gardens, school gardens, farm-to-school programs, farmers or public markets, and other small-scale collaborative initiatives.

Economic Development Strategy 5.c. Consider alternative food retail models including pop-ups, mobile markets, and food trucks in collaboration with local businesses and the Kitsap Public Health District.

Economic Development Strategy 5.d. Support equitable and affordable access to medical care and health care support services.

Economic Development Goal 6. Full and equal access

Provide opportunities for all people in Kitsap County to benefit equitably from economic development services, processes, and investments, regardless of identity, community, or socioeconomic circumstances.

Economic Development Policy 6.1. Foster a climate of equity, inclusivity, and belonging in economic development processes.

Economic Development Policy 6.2. Work towards ensuring all socioeconomic demographics have access to housing in Kitsap.

Economic Development Policy 6.3. Increase opportunities for public participation and community engagement regarding Kitsap County's economic development priorities.

Economic Development Policy 6.4. Analyze social equity impacts in local economic development strategic plans, policies, programs, and budgets.



Economic Development Policy 6.5. Support tailored economic development efforts and investments for historically marginalized communities.

Economic Development Strategy 6.a. Meaningfully engage historically underrepresented populations in economic development processes, including BIPOC, immigrant and low-income communities, LGBTQIA+, individuals with disabilities, and unhoused people.

Economic Development Strategy 6.b. Explore using an equity impact analyses to encourage and support a diverse representation in economic development discussions.

Economic Development Strategy 6.c. Develop partnerships with historically marginalized groups and communities to support the economic vitality of Kitsap County.

Economic Development Goal 7. Tourism

Support tourism development, strategies, and programs.

Economic Development Policy 7.1. Collaborate with tourism organizations, port districts, the private sector, entities providing visitor services, and user groups to enhance outcomes in the tourism sector.

Economic Development Policy 7.2. Support a wide variety of cultural, tourism, and active recreational programs within regional and neighborhood facilities.

Economic Development Policy 7.3. Encourage efforts to preserve scenic open space, historic and native lands, and local cultural resources that are attractive to both residents and visitors.

Economic Development Policy 7.4. Coordinate with cities and local tourism organizations on active participation in large regional sports and tourism events (e.g. FIFA World Cup, All-Star Games).

Economic Development Strategy 7.a. Identify and support current and potential visitor and event amenities and services.

Economic Development Strategy 7.b. Support development of ecotourism and agritourism, services, cultural attractions, and special events that capture and support tourism.

Economic Development Strategy 7.c. Promote public access to water bodies via the Kitsap Peninsula National Water Trails, the Maritime Washington National Heritage Area, and scenic drives through signage, maps, scenic pull-offs, and public information.

Economic Development Goal 8. Department of Defense operations

Accommodate growth in the defense industry including U.S. Naval operations and related supportive business.



Economic Development Policy 8.1.

Coordinate with the Department of the Navy, government contractors, and associated stakeholders, as appropriate, to improve the economic development environment in Kitsap County.

Economic Development Policy 8.2. Prioritize growth and retention of Kitsap’s defense industry.

Economic Development Policy 8.3. Increase opportunities for local business to obtain government contracts, as allowed by law.

Economic Development Strategy 8.a. Leverage anticipated U.S. Navy investment via the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program, and the homeporting of the Columbia class submarines at Naval Base Kitsap.

Economic Development Strategy 8.b. Support intergovernmental cooperative agreements promoting coordination and involvement in economic development activities that are of mutual interest.

Economic Development Goal 9. Health care

Accommodate growth in health care access, services and employment.



Economic Development Policy 9.1. Coordinate with medical centers and health care providers in meeting workforce and facility needs.

Economic Development Policy 9.2. Prioritize medical services in urban areas near transit and support services.

Economic Development Policy 9.3. Expand options for health care access to build local employment base and existing and future population.

Economic Development Strategy 9.a. Invest in expansion of health care education and training including the Olympic College Allied Health Campus.

Economic Development Strategy 9.b. Invest in transportation infrastructure around existing facilities, particularly those with expansion opportunities in Regional Growth Centers.



REFERENCES

- ONE Kitsap ([kitsapeda.org](https://www.kitsapeda.org))



GREAT BLUE HERON

CHAPTER 3

Environment



Chapter 3 / **Environment Element**

VISION

The County's vision for the environment is the protection of natural resources and systems through education, land use planning, and coordinated efforts that assure the forests, clean air, and water that Kitsap is known for are sustained for the benefit of current and future generations.

INTENT

The purpose of this element is to provide the goals, direction, and path for the future of sustaining natural environments in Kitsap County.

Kitsap County recognizes the importance of protecting the natural environment while providing for the needs of the growing number of residents and businesses that call this place home. Ecosystems such as forest lands, shorelines, freshwater systems, and other areas all make up the natural environment of Kitsap County. Human well-being depends on a healthy, natural environment to provide for clean air, clean water, food, and overall high quality of life. The quality and abundance of Kitsap County's natural environments are well documented and are what define Kitsap County as the "natural side of Puget Sound."

Since the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, and with a keen eye on planning for the future, Kitsap County has placed a higher priority on environmental sustainability in public policy. A community that embraces sustainability must continually improve the relationship between the developed and natural environments. This includes acknowledging the natural environment not only for its functions and values, but as an essential asset alongside other assets like roadways, buildings, and capital facilities. Like these other assets, the natural environment provides services and economic benefits that require planning, coordination, monitoring, and supportive fiscal policies and strategies.

GMA GOALS AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Growth Management Act (GMA) sets forth planning goals to guide the development of comprehensive plans. The following GMA planning goal directly addresses the environment: "Protect the environment and enhance the state's high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water."

In developing comprehensive plans to implement this planning goal, the GMA does not require that a comprehensive plan have an environment element. However, the Washington State Department of Commerce's guidelines for GMA implementation recommend that jurisdictions give "strong consideration" to including an element that addresses environmental protection, including protection of critical areas.

In addition to planning under GMA, Kitsap County plans in coordination with the other central Puget Sound region communities that make up the Puget Sound Regional Council. VISION 2050 is the most recent version of the region’s plan to provide an exceptional quality of life, opportunity for all, connected communities, a spectacular natural environment, and an innovative, thriving economy. Like earlier versions of the plan, Vision 2050 continues to focus on environmental stewardship, protection of farms and forests, and improving air quality. Further, VISION 2050 incorporates new policies and actions intended to more strongly support the recovery of Puget Sound, conservation of the regional open space network, and access to open space.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS


The goals, policies, and strategies in the Environment element are consistent with and may be implemented through the different elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including Land Use, Economic Development, Housing and Human Services, Transportation, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Capital Facilities and Utilities, and Climate Change.

BACKGROUND

Kitsap County strives to acknowledge its environment as an asset. Adjacent to Puget Sound and Hood Canal, the county includes 216 miles of marine shorelines. The county is part of Water Resource Inventory Area (WRIA) 15 located within the usual and accustomed places for the Suquamish, Port Gamble S’Klallam, Skokomish, Squaxin Island, and Puyallup Tribes and includes 1,000 miles of streams, numerous wetlands, lakes, and estuaries. Kitsap County’s landscape is varied, with large areas of forested land cover including second and third growth trees.



Figure 21. Water Resource Inventory Area 15 Map



Kitsap County protects the environment in many ways, including but not limited to the following:

- Kitsap County protects the natural environment in part through its adopted Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), Shoreline Master Program (SMP), and Stormwater Ordinance. Key elements of the natural environment in the County are regulated as critical areas, including geologically hazardous areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, wetlands, frequently flooded areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. These elements are defined, mapped, and regulated in the CAO. Under the GMA, the goals and policies of the SMP are considered an element of the County’s Comprehensive Plan. In addition to adopted regulations, Kitsap County achieves measurable environmental results in protecting and restoring ecological functions and values, including ensuring adequate consideration of anadromous fisheries and recovery of endangered salmon stock.
- Kitsap County actively acquires lands for long-term open space and passive recreation including fish and wildlife habitat areas, wetlands, and shorelines. Kitsap has acquired over 4,000 acres of private timber land in the last 10 years; doubling its open space lands.
- In 2018, Kitsap County began working with the Washington Environmental Council, Port Gamble S’Klallam Tribe, and Suquamish Tribe to develop the natural asset management program. This new management program defines baseline levels of service or functional conditions of forest cover, streams, and shorelines and aims to develop goals or desired level of service for each asset. The desired levels of service will help guide investments and prioritization of actions to restore and protect natural systems. In addition, County staff continue to explore further implementation of the program into County planning.
- Kitsap County continues to participate in Lead Entities for Salmon Recovery efforts and Local Integrating Organizations for Puget Sound ecosystem recovery work through the West Sound Partners for Ecosystem Recovery and Hood Canal Coordinating Council.
- Kitsap County continues to carry out its programs under the “Water as a Resource” policy (Kitsap County Resolution 134-2016), which cooperatively addresses water as a resource, not a waste stream.
- Kitsap County’s programs that affect and address public water supply also work to provide for protection of the quality and quantity of groundwater.
- Kitsap County works with area Tribes, agencies, and other groups to protect important natural environments including those prioritized by tribal treaty rights.
- Kitsap County works with incorporated cities and neighboring counties to plan and implement actions that restore and protect the health of watersheds that cross jurisdictional boundaries.

A growing array of tools and strategies exist to help Kitsap County with sustainable development, as well as for environmental protection and restoration. Other tools, strategies, and practices are needed,



especially related to integrating natural features into the built environments and to address the impacts of climate change.

KEY TERMS

Asset management - refers to treating the components of the public infrastructure system as assets within the public trust to be stewarded by the local government.

Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program - (KNRAMP) is a new framework to manage natural assets (such as forests, streams, and shorelines) using the same asset management and capital improvements principles that municipalities use to manage built infrastructure. The Program provides a mechanism to incorporate nature-based solutions and green infrastructure practices into traditional infrastructure planning and uses ecosystem services principles to quantify the “level of service” (LOS) provided by natural resources, using the same terminology as public works for prioritizing investments in grey infrastructure.

Levels of service - measures of the condition and performance of the asset in relation to the expected service. The Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program defines the levels of service provided by streams, forests, and marine shorelines. Methodologies used for calculating Level of Service are based on best available science, per RCW 36.70A.172, and may require revision over time as additional or improved data become available.

Life-cycle cost analysis – an analysis used to determine the total cost of a project or activity over its lifetime. It includes the cost of planning, design, construction or start-up, and the costs to operate, maintain, and eventually dissolve or dispose.

Cost-benefit analysis - considers costs as well as environmental, social, and public health outcomes of alternative approaches. It is a more complete basis for comprehensive decision making.

Low Impact Development a stormwater and land-use management strategy that tries to mimic natural hydrologic conditions using practices such as bio-retention, rain gardens, permeable pavements, minimal excavation foundations, vegetated roofs, and rainwater harvesting.

Best Available Science - under the state [Growth Management Act](#) (GMA), local governments are required to use the best available science in their policies and regulations on critical areas. Best available science means current scientific information used in the process to designate, protect, or restore critical areas, that is derived from a valid scientific process as defined by the Washington Administrative Code.

No Net Loss - a standard that ensures new developments do not introduce new impacts that decrease ecological functions. If impacts do occur, projects must mitigate those impacts to demonstrate no net loss.

Ecosystem Services - the benefits that humans receive from nature. These benefits support almost all aspects of human well-being, including food, clean and plentiful water, clean air, recreation, climate stabilization, security, health, and economy.

ENVIRONMENT GOALS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

Environment Goal 1. Ecosystems and habitat

Protect and enhance the health, resilience, functions, and processes of natural environments and ecosystems, including forest lands, shorelines, freshwater systems, and critical areas to ensure functioning ecosystem services and fish and wildlife habitat are sustained into the future.



Environment Policy 1.1. Manage development to protect habitats and ecological processes.

Environment Policy 1.2. Consider the functions and processes of the natural environment in project planning and review.

Environment Policy 1.3. Protect and restore marine shorelines, riparian areas, wetlands, floodplains, and estuaries.

Environment Policy 1.4. Preserve and restore the functions of natural habitat to support ESA-listed species, state listed animal and plant species, and species of local importance.

Environment Policy 1.5. Accelerate implementation of habitat acquisition and restoration projects as prioritized in salmon and watershed recovery plans.

Environment Policy 1.6. Enhance urban tree canopy and promote benefits of urban forests as it relates to a healthy environment, climate change, stormwater, and community livability.

Environment Strategy 1.a. Direct population growth into walkable, transit-oriented urban growth areas (UGAs) with easy access to natural space.

Environment Strategy 1.b. Coordinate an improved development planning and review system that improves the ecological function and values of the natural environment while meeting Growth Management Act requirements for land use, capital facilities, housing, protection of critical areas, and economic development.

Environment Strategy 1.c. Provide incentive-based, non-regulatory programs for the protection of the natural environment such as acquisition of important habitats through fee-simple and conservation easements from willing sellers. Institutionalize the Shore Friendly Kitsap Program which provides technical assistance for residential property owners to motivate voluntary actions for healthy shorelines.

Environment Strategy 1.d. Establish permanent funding and seek additional funding opportunities to protect and restore natural systems.



Environment Strategy 1.e. Establish development standards and design guidelines that protect tree canopy in urban and rural areas.

Environment Strategy 1.f. Coordinate ecosystem restoration strategies with tribal, federal, state, and local jurisdictions, countywide planning groups, and watershed groups in watersheds regulated and managed by the County.



Environment Strategy 1.g. Convene experts to strategize on prioritization, funding, and regulatory and non-regulatory incentives to acquiring, restoring, and managing public lands for conservation purposes.

Environment Strategy 1.h. Support and incentivize the protection of high priority habitat and ecosystems, their functions, and the processes that form and maintain them with the Conservation Futures Tax Program.

Environment Strategy 1.i. Submit the required annual report to the Federal Emergency Management Agency regarding Kitsap County's status on review of projects for compliance with the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Biological Opinion Puget Sound, as well as progress towards achieving programmatic compliance.

Environment Strategy 1.j. Develop and adopt a salmon and ecosystem recovery plan for Kitsap County that guides funding and implementation of restoration and protection projects and programs.

Environment Strategy 1.k. Convene experts to plan and develop strategies for promoting a thriving beaver population in Kitsap County. Strategies should encourage recolonization of beavers, reduce beaver-human conflicts by protecting and restoring suitable beaver habitat, relocating vulnerable infrastructure away from areas likely to be flooded by beavers, restricting removal and modification of beaver dams except in extreme circumstances, and providing public education about the benefits of beavers in recovering natural ecosystems.

Environment Strategy 1.m. Establish and implement a monitoring and evaluation program to determine the effectiveness of restoration, enhancement, and recovery strategies.

Environment Strategy 1.n. Work with tribal, public, and private sector partners to restore aquatic ecosystems and protect tribal treaty rights through the removal of fish passage and migration barriers.

Environment Strategy 1.o. Identify, protect, and enhance terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems so that they maintain viable, reproducing populations of plants and animals.

Environment Goal 2. Critical areas

Designate and protect critical areas. Critical areas include wetlands, critical aquifer recharge areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, frequently flooded areas, and geologically hazardous areas.



Environment Policy 2.1. Use the best available science in developing policies and development regulations to protect the functions and values of critical areas, consistent with the criteria in WAC 365-195.

Environment Policy 2.2. Give special consideration to conservation or protection measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries.

Environment Policy 2.3. Provide development regulations that protect all functions and values of critical areas to ensure no net loss of ecological functions and values.

Environment Policy 2.4. When necessary to consider expanding an urban growth area, avoid including lands that contain mapped critical areas.

Environment Policy 2.5. When necessary to consider expanding an urban growth area, avoid including new areas within a 100-year flood plain unless no other alternatives exist.

Environment Policy 2.6. Prioritize protection of open space and habitat corridors where connection between critical areas may be included.

Environment Strategy 2.a. Designate critical areas by using the best available maps and continuously improve mapping, inventory, and baseline information.

Environment Strategy 2.b. Establish a monitoring and adaptive management program to ensure regulations are efficient and effective at protecting critical area functions and values.

Best Available Science (BAS)

BAS means the current and best available information that follows a valid scientific process, including using peer review, standardized methods, and logical conclusions and reasonable inferences, among others. Common sources include research, monitoring, inventory, modeling, assessment, and synthesis.

Through the application of BAS, local jurisdictions need to consider measures necessary to preserve or enhance anadromous fisheries. **Anadromous fish** are fish that are born in freshwater, spend most of their lives in saltwater, and return to freshwater to spawn. These fish include Chinook, chum, coho, pink, and sockeye salmon, steelhead, and certain bull trout, among others.



Environment Strategy 2.c. Improve monitoring and tracking of projects that impact critical area buffers or provide enhancement and restoration to improve effectiveness and long-term success of mitigation.

Environment Strategy 2.d. Acknowledge the benefits of non-listed species to natural systems and water availability and explore designating Species of Local Importance in the Critical Areas Ordinance.

Environment Goal 3. Natural resources as an asset

Formally treat natural environments and ecosystems including forest lands, shorelines, freshwater systems, and critical areas as essential assets that are planned for, managed, and invested in to meet the needs of current and future generations.



Environment Policy 3.1. Recognize that a healthy and vibrant environment is a foundation of strong social, community, health, and other positive outcomes.

Environment Policy 3.2. County Departments and the Board of County Commissioners cooperatively plan for, invest in, track progress, and adaptively manage the natural environment as an essential asset in addition to standard preservation and conservation efforts.

Environmental Policy 3.3. Define natural assets, develop levels of service for each asset, and improve the inventory of assets and their condition through continuous mapping improvement and gathering of baseline information. Work with the community and decision makers to develop levels of service.

Environment Policy 3.4. Promote the most efficient and effective use of public financial resources for County projects and programs by expanding the standard framework for managing infrastructure to include natural assets.

Environment Strategy 3.a. Adopt and implement the Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program as a mechanism to manage, plan for, and invest in Kitsap County's natural environment as an essential asset. Other mechanisms may include, but are not limited to, plans, ordinances, resolutions, or official policy directives.

Environment Strategy 3.b. Assess whether amendments are warranted to relevant codes or programs to ensure that the natural environment is being managed as an essential asset.

Environment Strategy 3.c. Develop mechanisms in addition to the Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program to identify, document, and evaluate how the natural environment is assessed in land use, transportation, stormwater utility, parks, and other County plans.

Environment Strategy 3.d. Develop a monitoring program to systematically produce annual reports on the quantitative changes to natural environments based on land cover changes, development projects constructed, types and sizes of mitigation, or other appropriate metrics and the net result for natural resources essential asset management.

Environment Strategy 3.e. Develop a framework to determine economic value of ecosystem including methods to identify, describe, and evaluate the quantifiable services provided by natural environments.

Environment Strategy 3.f. Use project analysis methods including, but not limited to, life-cycle cost analysis, cost-benefit analysis, and equity analysis to ensure efficient and effective use of public funds for environmental projects and programs when practicable.

Environment Goal 4. Collaboration and partnerships

Coordinate natural environment management and recovery with internal and external partners.

Environment Policy 4.1. Collaborate across County programs and external agencies and organizations that supply data, analysis, and support for managing and restoring natural environments and resources.

Environment Policy 4.2. Provide regional leadership with cities, tribes, and County-wide programs to identify priority environmental issues that affect the Kitsap Peninsula.

Environment Strategy 4.a. Identify areas of joint interest among County programs, state agencies, tribes, conservation land trusts, state, and federal departments, including Defense, which may facilitate partnerships in data sharing, funding, and stewardship for the environment.

Environment Strategy 4.b. Coordinate the County's goals and priorities on natural resources asset management planning with the Puget Sound Partnership, Puget Sound Regional Council, Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council, the West Sound and Hood Canal Lead Entities for Salmon Recovery and Local Integrating Organizations, Tribes, and other regional coordinating bodies as appropriate.

Environment Strategy 4.c. Work across jurisdictions to identify, protect, and restore networks of natural habitat areas and functions that cross political boundaries.



Environment Goal 5. Use Best Practices

Utilize best practices to protect people, property, and the natural environment.

Environment Policy 5.1. Use appropriate regulatory and incentive-based approaches in land use, transportation, and development engineering programs.

Environment Policy 5.2. Employ Best Management Practices to protect the long-term integrity of the natural environment, adjacent land uses, and the productivity of resource lands.

Environment Policy 5.3. Maintain and enhance long term quality and quantity of water resources.

Environment Policy 5.4. Reduce health impacts to vulnerable populations such as low-income communities, Black, Indigenous, and communities of color, people with disabilities, seniors, and communities that are disproportionately affected by noise, air pollution, or other environmental hazards.

Environment Strategy 5.a. Explore opportunities for mitigation banks and participate in mitigation programs.

Environment Strategy 5.b. Utilize current and accurate maps and data available during the development review process and planning efforts.

Environment Strategy 5.c. Ensure staff and the development community are trained on the use of emerging best practices in the area of sustainable land use practices, including green building and site design, and create awareness of these preferred practices through the use of pilot programs, model ordinances, education, and incentives, while in balance with other Growth Management Act required elements.

Environment Strategy 5.d. Identify and protect critical aquifer recharge areas by utilizing Low Impact Development (LID) site planning principles to the greatest extent possible for reducing stormwater runoff.

Environment Strategy 5.e. Use stormwater Best Management Practices (BMPs) to improve water quality and quantity.

Environment Strategy 5.f. Develop and implement programs supporting the retrofit of surface and stormwater management infrastructure to more protective standards.

Environment Strategy 5.g. Coordinate watershed and land use planning to implement preservation and restoration of aquatic habitat and reduce impacts to natural systems.



Environment Strategy 5.h. Provide public resources to identify parcels likely to be flooded and consider incentivizing relocation of structures away from such areas.

Environment Goal 6. Outreach and Education

The public is informed about opportunities for stewardship and engaged in dialogue regarding the management and protection of the natural environment.

Environment Policy 6.1. Educate County residents and businesses about the function and benefits of a healthy ecosystem.

Environment Policy 6.2. Recognize the vital connection between protection of the County's rural character, essential environmental assets, environmental benefits, and economic opportunities.

Environment Policy 6.3. Increase opportunities for public participation and community engagement regarding Kitsap County's environmental protections.

Environment Strategy 6.a. Support and incentivize voluntary stream, wetland, riparian, and shoreline restoration and preservation efforts.

Environment Strategy 6.b. Develop and implement education, outreach, and incentive programs to improve regulatory compliance.

REFERENCES

[Shoreline Master Program](#)

[Critical Areas Ordinance](#)

[Water as a Resource](#)

[Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management](#)

[Kitsap County Climate Change](#)





SILVERDALE, WA

CHAPTER 4

Housing

Chapter 4 / **Housing Element**

VISION

The County encourages and supports a diverse and integrated mix of housing that includes housing for all ages, family types, abilities and limitations, household sizes, backgrounds, cultures, and incomes. This approach helps to build strong community connections and promotes a healthy lifestyle where residents are able to walk, bike, or roll to community destinations and comfortably and safely shop, work, and interact with neighbors and friends. Residential communities are attractive, affordable, diverse, and livable, supported by appropriate urban or rural services. A variety of housing choices are available, meeting a full range of resident income levels and preferences.

INTENT

The County recognizes that housing is a fundamental need. The County is responsible for providing policy direction that facilitates housing for residents in all economic segments. The goals and policies of this element set the stage for development regulations that allow for and encourage different types of housing affordable to all population segments, avoid concentrating housing in environmentally sensitive areas, and guide intergovernmental coordination that makes the most efficient use of resources to provide housing, while reducing or eliminating housing barriers.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Washington State Growth Management Act is the framework for all land use planning in the state and lays out the requirements for comprehensive plans and development regulations that implement the plans. Housing is a required element and must include:

- Inventory of housing needs;
- Provisions for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing, including moderate density housing forms in Urban Growth Areas;
- Capacity of land available for housing;
- Provisions for housing of all economic segments;
- Documentation of actions needed to achieve housing availability;
- Consideration of housing located near employment;
- Consideration of accessory dwelling units;
- Identification of racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion from housing and policies to address and undo the same;
- Consideration of buildable lands report and reasonable measures.



As with the Comprehensive Plan as a whole, Housing goals and policies must reflect the requirements of the Growth Management Act as outlined above, be consistent with Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) VISION 2050 plan and its Multicounty Planning Policies (MPPs), and conform to the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) adopted by the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). This includes all the Kitsap County jurisdictions adopting the allocation of housing units as prescribed by the Washington State Department of Commerce.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

Housing goals and policies in this Comprehensive Plan form an integral basis for the other comprehensive plan elements including Economic Development, Environment, Housing, Transportation, Parks, Recreation, and Open Space, Capital Facilities and Utilities, and Climate Change. Specifically impacted are locations of housing relative to employment, recreation, education, and transit.

The Housing Element is tied to the county's land capacity evaluation. Residential land uses are analyzed to ensure there is sufficient land at a variety of densities to accommodate housing needs at all income levels, including special needs housing and permanent supportive housing.

The Housing Element and the Silverdale Regional Center subarea plan are especially intertwined. The Silverdale Regional Center is anticipated to accommodate a significant proportion of the county's population and employment growth. At the same time, it is already home to a large proportion of existing urban-density housing in the unincorporated county. Silverdale is also anticipated to incorporate as a city later in the planning period. Accordingly, the subarea plan for the regional center builds on the Housing Element with additional policies and strategies to emphasize the built environment, including housing, needed to accommodate the employment and housing growth expected in Silverdale.

BACKGROUND

Kitsap County has had stable population growth over the past two decades. Much of the growth is driven by the County's location in the Central Puget Sound and its relative proximity to jobs in King, Pierce, and Snohomish Counties, as well as Naval Base Kitsap. This said, Kitsap County has also increased its job base over the past two decades as well.

Figure 22. Map of Kitsap County in relation to neighboring counties and cities






Figure 23. Year-over-year percent change in population, 1990-2022



Source: U.S. Census Bureau and Washington State Office of Financial Management, analysis by ECO Northwest

Kitsap County’s housing stock continues to be primarily single-family detached housing with concentrations of multi-family housing in Bremerton, Port Orchard, and unincorporated urban growth areas, especially Silverdale.

Figure 24. Housing units in cities and the unincorporated county, 2023



Source: Office of Financial Management (OFM) postcensal estimates of housing units, 2021-2023

Kitsap County is projected to gain an additional 70,747 residents between 2020 and 2044, for a total estimated population of approximately 346,358 persons. This implies a need for approximately 32,950

new housing units by 2044 across all jurisdictions (inclusive of cities, unincorporated areas, and rural areas). The County must align with new Washington State requirements through amendments to the GMA and Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) VISION 2050 regarding housing choices and affordability to ensure homes are available for all income levels.

Specifically, the GMA was amended to require that fully planning counties and cities “plan for and accommodate” housing that is affordable to all economic segments of the population. They must also provide an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs that identifies the number of housing units needed to accommodate projected growth, including units for moderate (81-120% AMI), low (51-80% AMI), and very low/extremely low-income (0-50% AMI) households as well as special housing types like emergency housing, emergency shelters, and permanent supportive housing. The Department of Commerce developed guidance and draft methodology for calculating how much housing in each income bracket a community must plan for and how it can demonstrate capacity for these allocations. Kitsap County adopted into its Countywide Planning Policies a set of housing allocations through 2044 to meet these new state requirements. Table 9, below, shows the permanent and emergency housing needs by jurisdiction within Kitsap County by 2044. Kitsap County must plan for and accommodate 14,498 permanent housing units from 2020 through 2044, plus 612 emergency housing beds for persons experiencing homelessness.

Table 9. Housing Allocations through 2044

			Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)							Emergency Housing** Needs (Temporary)
			0 – 30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
		Total	Non-PSH*	PSH						
Unincorporated Kitsap County	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	69,987	1,802	8	7,335	21,046	13,531	7,815	18,450	153
	Allocation (2020-2044)	14,498	2,768	1,214	2,376	1,996	1,028	1,012	4,103	612



			Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)							Emergency Housing** Needs (Temporary)
			0 – 30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
		Total	Non-PSH*	PSH						
Bainbridge Island city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	11,251	331	0	331	788	1,150	2,073	6,578	0
	Allocation (2020-2044)	1,977	377	166	324	272	140	138	560	83
Bremerton city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	18,351	1,346	106	3,030	8,960	2,496	879	1,534	316
	Allocation (2020-2044)	9,556	1,824	800	1,566	1,316	678	667	2,705	403
Port Orchard city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	6,209	288	0	619	2,051	1,246	717	1,288	11
	Allocation (2020-2044)	4,943	944	414	810	680	351	345	1,399	209
Poulsbo city	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	5,116	356	0	422	1,062	915	594	1,767	1

			Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)							Emergency Housing** Needs (Temporary)
			0 – 30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%	>120%	
		Total	Non-PSH*	PSH						
	Allocation (2020-2044)	1,977	377	166	324	272	140	138	560	83

Source: HAPT Tool, Washington State Department of Commerce

Table 10, below, shows the permanent and emergency housing capacity by income range and housing type, based on zoning code, within Kitsap County by 2044. Kitsap County’s housing capacity in the Preferred Alternative for income range of 0-80% AMI is 7,175 housing units (8,354 housing units needed), for income range of 81%-120% AMI is 1,874 housing units (2,040 housing units needed), and for income range greater than 120% AMI is 4,179 housing units (8,179 housing units needed). The emergency housing beds capacity is sufficient to meet the need of 612 housing beds for persons experiencing homelessness based on Kitsap County Code parcels that are vacant or underutilized with a permitted “Group Living” use. See Appendix A for methodology and calculation details.



Table 10. Capacity versus housing allocation by income bracket, unincorporated Kitsap County

Income Range	Housing Need 2044	Housing Type Accommodating	Zones Focused	Alt 1 Capacity	Alt 2 Capacity	Alt 3 Capacity	Preferred Alternative Capacity
0-30%	2,768	Multi-Family	RC, C, UVC, NC, UH, UM				
0-30% PSH	1,214	Multi-Family	RC, C, UVC, NC, UH, UM				
31%-50%	2,376	Multi-Family	RC, C, UVC, NC, UH, UM				
51%-80%	1,996	Multi-Family, Single-Family - Attached, Cottage Housing	RC, C, UVC, NC, UH, UM, UCR, UL, UR, GB				
Sub-Total	8,354						
81%-100%	1,028	Single Family - Detached	UCR, UL, UR, GB				
101%-120%	1,012	Single Family - Detached	UCR, UL, UR, GB				
Sub-Total	2,040						
>120%	4,103	Single Family - Detached	UCR, UL, UR, GB				
Sub-Total	4,103						
Total	14,497			9,592	15,210	12,677	13,228
Emergency Housing	612	Facility	RC, C, UVC, NC, I				Sufficient Capacity

Source: Land Capacity Analysis, Kitsap County

Kitsap County has completed a technical analysis of housing gaps compared to income-based housing allocations in unincorporated Kitsap County.

The Preferred Alternative provides somewhat less housing than Alternative 2 due to fewer UGA expansions and the incorporation of the revisions to the Critical Areas Ordinance and tree canopy requirements, but significantly more than current conditions (Alternative 1) and relatively close to the housing need by zoning category. Table 11 below shows the performance of the Preferred Alternative relative to housing needs. For more details, see Appendix A: Housing Element Technical Analysis.

Table 11. Preferred Alternative Capacity Relative to Projected Housing Need

Income Level (% AMI)	Projected Housing Need	Zone Categories Serving These Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs ¹	Total Capacity	Capacity Surplus (Deficit)
0-30% PSH	1,214	Low-Rise Multifamily, Mid-Rise Multifamily, ADUs	7,747 (non-pipeline) + 607 (pipeline) = 8,354	6,187 (non-pipeline) + 607 (pipeline) + 381 ADU = 7,175	(1,179)
0-30% Non-PSH	2,768				
31-50%	2,376				
51-80%	1,996				
81-100%	1,028	Moderate Density	2,040	1,874	(166)
101-120%	1,012				
>120%	4,103	Low Density	2,342 (non-pipeline) + 1,761 (pipeline) = 4,103	2,418 (non-pipeline) + 1,761 (pipeline) = 4,179	76
Total	14,497		12,129 (non-pipeline) + 2,368 (pipeline) = 14,497	13,228 (including 2,368 pipeline units and 381 ADUs)	(1,269)

Source: Facet 2024, incorporated into this plan as Appendix A

Statistics from the U.S. Census Bureau and other sources comparing household characteristics and housing stock between 2000 and 2020 show that a majority of Kitsap County residents are homeowners, although the proportion that rent their unit has grown slowly from 33 percent to 37 percent. The price of owning a home has risen much faster than household incomes, leading to cost burden and a lack of suitable housing for many households. Acknowledging that residents have a wide range of housing needs, with size, transit access, price, and other factors playing a role, housing for first time homebuyers is declining in Kitsap County. The county has a large percentage of renters and

¹ Pipeline projects added in separately based on unit type.




homeowners earning less than the county median and paying more than 30 percent of their income for housing, meeting the definition of cost-burdened households.

Table 12. Median household income 2000-2020, various jurisdictions

Median Household Income (2020 Dollars)	2000	2010	2020	Percent Change, 2000–2020
Kingston	\$61,028	\$62,579	\$77,008	26.2%
Silverdale	\$71,362	\$72,044	\$81,458	14.1%
Kitsap County	\$70,399	\$70,679	\$78,969	12.2%
Washington	\$68,800	\$67,943	\$77,006	11.9%


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 3 – Table HCT012) and ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20. Dollar amounts for 2000 and 2010 adjusted for inflation using Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers and All Items (annual, not seasonally adjusted). Analysis by ECO Northwest.

Figure 25. Household Tenure in Occupied Units, Kitsap County, 2000-2020



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 2 – Table DP1) and ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Table DP04). Analysis by ECO Northwest.

Figure 26. Share of cost burden by tenure in occupied units, Kitsap County, 2000 to 2020



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File X – Tables H069 and H090) and ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Tables B25070 and B25091)


Housing instability and homelessness affect many people in Kitsap County. This has a detrimental effect on families, individuals, and the community as a whole. While market forces will provide a mix of housing types and styles that meet the housing needs of a portion of the population and the market will encourage the redevelopment of some housing under the current regulatory environment, housing across the spectrum of ownership, type, and affordability is needed throughout the county.

Many Kitsap County residents encounter housing access and affordability challenges, which have a negative impact on their ability to gain or establish wealth. These issues have grown since the Great Recession and accelerated by the COVID pandemic. They have a disproportionate impact on lower-income renters, communities of color, and other vulnerable groups. Additionally, data show that younger and middle-aged households in Kitsap County are struggling to obtain homeownership at the same rates as more senior households.

Figure 27, below, identifies displacement risk in Kitsap County. The areas around Bremerton and Port Orchard are categorized by PSRC’s displacement risk index as having moderate risk of displacement, while the rest of the county has a lower risk.



Figure 27. PSRC Displacement Risk Map for Kitsap County



Source: PSRC

Renters, and renters of color in particular, are at greater risk of displacement. As Kitsap County's population grows and its UGAs become denser and more urban, policies to prevent displacement are required to give residents in communities facing displacement the option to remain and thrive in their communities and avail themselves of new amenities and services.

More recently, the COVID-19 pandemic and its effect on the economy, including a brief but deep recession and subsequent inflation and other housing market distortions, compounded the housing crisis. Governmental social support programs assisted renters through financial assistance services and eviction moratoria in the initial years of the pandemic. With the subsequent end to these programs, low-income renters may be challenged to meet escalating housing costs. Reducing housing cost burden disparities that affect renters so disproportionately could involve reforms to tenant-landlord relationships as well as code and program reforms that aim to increase the number of specific types of units available.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROGRAMS

Kitsap County partners with a variety of developers and housing providers (e.g. Bremerton Housing Authority, Housing Kitsap, non-profits) to build and operate below market rate housing that serves households below 80 percent of area median income. Kitsap County is served by two housing authorities (Housing Kitsap and the Bremerton Housing Authority) and several other non-profit organizations that own and operate rental housing, offer homeownership programs, and/or provide supportive housing and shelters.

The County has several funding streams used to address affordable housing and homelessness, including:

- Federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnership (HOME) funds from the US Dept. of Housing and Urban Development. Funds are guided by priorities in the 5-year Consolidated Plan. The County receives approximately \$1,000,000 in CDBG funds annually and approximately \$750,000 in HOME funds annually. The City of Bremerton also receives an annual CDBG allocation from HUD directly.
- Homeless Housing Grant Program (HHGP) funds, Affordable Housing Grant Program (AHGP) and Consolidated Homeless Grant (CHG) funds. These funds are generated by document recording fees as required by RCW 36.22.250, currently set at \$183 per eligible recorded document. The Kitsap Crisis Response and Housing Plan guides the priorities for these funds.
- Community Investments in Affordable Housing (CIAH) funds. These funds are generated by a sales and use tax credit against the state's share of the sales and use tax. This funding is provided by the state legislature through RCW 82.14.540 and RCW 82.14.530. The County receives a combined sales and use tax credit of 0.1146 percent on all items and services subject to the sales and use tax within unincorporated Kitsap County and all municipalities that do not levy this tax. The county generates approximately \$5,500,000 annually in CIAH funds. Municipalities that do levy this tax but do not have a qualifying local tax receive a credit of 0.0073 percent. Poulsbo and Bainbridge Island are the two municipalities in Kitsap County that levy both sales and use taxes.

According to the City of Bremerton and Kitsap County Affordable Housing Recommendations Report (ECO Northwest, March 2020), additional revenue sources the County could consider to fund affordable housing and homelessness include:

- Revolving Loan Fund. A revolving loan fund is a pool of money from which loans are issued to eligible recipients for specific uses. In the case of affordable housing revolving loan funds, the funds have lower interest rates and more generous terms compared to market loans. When the loans are repaid, new loans can be issued. A revolving loan fund can be used to fill funding gaps in a development deal for affordable housing. Funds are generally short term (1-2 years for predevelopment loans, 3-5 years for construction loans). The sources of the funds include public funders, philanthropic funders, banks, and other institutions. The



fundors understand they will have lower rates of return compared to other investment funds in exchange for positive social impact.

- Real Estate Investment Trust. A REIT is a financing vehicle that are stand-alone companies or investment entities that own and usually operate income-producing real estate. They generate stable, moderately low-risk real estate investments for private equity. REITs have a dual focus on generating competitive (albeit below market rate) quarterly returns and preserving moderately affordable housing. REITs cannot invest in properties offering units affordable to low- and very-low-income households (below 50 percent), because the properties must be able to generate income.

Those who access affordable housing assistance often need access to other types of services. The County strives to provide essential human services accessible to all who need them. These services address individual and community needs, preserve the rights and dignity of the recipients of those services, promote the health and well-being of all residents, and prevent marginalization and homelessness. Services are provided directly by the County Department of Human Services, contractors to the County, and a network of programs throughout the area. They assist many of the community's most vulnerable populations including low-income seniors, persons with disabilities, Veterans, people with substance use disorder, underserved youth, and people with behavioral health issues. This holistic approach helps provide better long-term outcomes for people in need. Human Services is reflected in the Housing Element as a sub-section addressing these issues.

For more information and analysis, please see Appendix B: Housing Availability and Affordability Analysis.

KEY TERMS

Accessory Dwelling Units - a dwelling unit located on the same lot as a single-family housing unit, duplex, triplex, townhome, or other housing unit.

Area median income (AMI) - the midpoint of a specific area's income distribution and is calculated on an annual basis by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD uses the term median family income (MFI) based on different household sizes in setting affordability limits for vouchers and subsidies.

Cottage housing - residential units on a lot with a common open space that either is owned in common, or has units owned as condominium units with property in common and a minimum of 20 percent of the lot size as open space.

Courtyard apartments - up to four attached dwelling units arranged on two or three sides of a yard or court.

Duplex - a multifamily home that sits on a single plot of land with two units separated by a wall or floor. This means duplex units can be either side by side or stacked.

Emergency housing - temporary indoor accommodations for individuals or families who are unhoused or at imminent risk of becoming unhoused that is intended to address the basic health, food, clothing, and personal hygiene needs of individuals or families. Emergency housing may or may not require occupants to enter into a lease or an occupancy agreement.

Emergency shelter - a facility that provides a temporary shelter for individuals or families who are currently unhoused. Emergency shelter may not require occupants to enter into a lease or occupancy agreement. Emergency shelter facilities may include day and warming shelters that do not provide overnight accommodations.

Extremely low-income household - a single person, family, or unrelated persons living together whose adjusted income is at or below thirty percent of the median household income adjusted for household size, for the county where the household is located, as reported by HUD.

Low-income household - a single person, family, or unrelated persons living together whose adjusted income is at or below eighty percent of the median household income adjusted for household size, for the county where the household is located, as reported by HUD.

Low-rise residential or apartments - buildings that are three stories or less. They are commonly served by stair access. They are also frequently referred to as walk-up apartments or garden apartments.

Median Family Income (MFI) - the point that divides an income distribution (in this case incomes for family households) in half, with half the values in the sample or population above the median and the other half above the median. The median is based on the income distributions of all households, including those with no income.



Middle housing - buildings that are compatible in scale, form, and character with single-family houses and contain two or more attached, stacked, or clustered homes duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, fiveplexes, sixplexes, townhouses, stacked flats, courtyard apartments, and cottage housing.

Mid-rise residential or apartments - are buildings that are between four to eight stories and served by elevator access. They generally feature some form of structured parking (above and/or below grade).

Moderate-income household - means a single person, family, or unrelated persons living together whose adjusted income is at or below 120 percent of the median household income adjusted for household size, for the county where the household is located, as reported by HUD.

Multi-Family Housing - Any housing that contains two or more units attached.

Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) - means subsidized, leased housing with no limit on length of stay that prioritizes people who need comprehensive support services to retain tenancy and utilizes admissions practices designed to use lower barriers to entry than would be typical for other subsidized or unsubsidized rental housing, especially related to rental history, criminal history, and personal behaviors. Permanent supportive housing is paired with on-site or off-site voluntary services designed to support a person living with a complex and disabling behavioral health or physical health condition who was experiencing homelessness or was at imminent risk of homelessness prior to moving into housing to retain their housing and be a successful tenant in a housing arrangement, improve the resident's health status, and connect the resident of the housing with a community-based health care, treatment, or employment services.

Townhouses (townhomes) - means buildings that contain three or more attached single-family dwelling units that extend from foundation to roof and that have a yard or public way on not less than two sides.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) - means the cabinet-level governmental agency in the federal government responsible for, among other things, community development block grant funds and housing vouchers and subsidies.

Very low-income household - means a single person, family, or unrelated persons living together whose adjusted income is at or below fifty percent of the median household income adjusted for household size, for the county where the household is located, as reported by HUD.

Zero lot line subdivision - also referred to as townhome subdivision or unit lot subdivision. This refers to a land segregation whereby the lot can be as small as the unit itself, but unlike a condominium, the owner of the zero lot line unit owns the land as well as the improvements. Zero lot line refers to the fact that the lot line separating two attached units runs down a wall separating them, making the side setback from the lot line zero feet.

HOUSING GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Housing Goal 1. Accessible and resilient housing

Promote the preservation, rehabilitation, and development of housing that contributes to healthy and accessible built environments.

Housing Policy 1.1. Promote housing preservation and development in areas that are already near jobs and well-served by utilities, schools, public transportation and multi-modal options, green spaces, commercial facilities, and have adequate infrastructure to support alternative modes of transportation.



Housing Policy 1.2. Support programs and regulations that encourage the rehabilitation of housing deemed inadequate due to conditions posing a risk to human health and safety.

Housing Policy 1.3. Ensure sufficient capacity of land is available to accommodate new construction and redevelopment for housing growth targets as established in this Comprehensive Plan.

Housing Policy 1.4. Coordinate with Tribes, cities, agencies, and community organizations, especially cultural groups, on strategies to mitigate the impacts of displacement in the preservation, rehabilitation, and development process. This includes displacement of residents, or displacement of commercial uses vital to low-income households.

Housing Policy 1.5. Support programs and resources that reduce energy use and increase climate resiliency in housing preservation, rehabilitation, and development, especially for communities historically marginalized and underserved.

Housing Strategy 1.a. Support community-based organizations in their efforts to fund weatherization and improvements to substandard housing units.

Housing Strategy 1.b. Ensure that newly planned housing is served by public services and utilities that meet level of service standards by promoting upgrades when necessary.

Housing Strategy 1.c. Coordinate with Kitsap Transit to expand transit service aligned with housing diversity goals.

Housing Strategy 1.d. Explore the development of a rental inspection program or expand building code enforcement to find and correct substandard living conditions.

Housing Strategy 1.e. Explore the adoption of a historic preservation ordinance and become a Certified Local Government in order to provide access to tax benefits for rehabilitated historic residential properties.



Housing Strategy 1.f. Adopt a requirement that applicants for development that dislocates or displaces existing residents or vital low-income community resources must create relocation plans to mitigate displacement.

Housing Strategy 1.g. Coordinate with municipalities and providers of subsidized and/or income-restricted housing to develop consistent programs that offer displaced residents rights of first refusal for available units affordable to those residents across the county when redevelopment displaces affordable units.

Housing Goal 2. Economically available housing

Ensure that a broad range of housing types are available across all economic segments of the community and demographic groups from both private and public development.

Housing Policy 2.1. Support regulatory updates to allow a wide range of housing types in urban areas.

Housing Policy 2.2. Coordinate the review and evaluation of regulations, programs, and community resources with Tribes, agencies, and jurisdictions to offer a variety of housing types across income levels.

Housing Policy 2.3. Evaluate that available housing types align with the needs of residents across income levels and demographic groups.

Housing Strategy 2.a. Review and revise as necessary dimensional standards, use standards, and design standards to allow for a wide variety of housing types.

Housing Strategy 2.b. Develop incentive programs to increase housing in the 30-80% AMI range, such as voluntary inclusionary zoning, Multi-Family Tax Exemption, or expedited permit review.

Housing Strategy 2.c. Evaluate support of a program to match homeowners with roommate-renters.

Housing Strategy 2.d. Evaluate existing development regulations and consider modifications to allow for boarding houses, Single Room Occupancy buildings, and micro-units. This would include definitions, modifications to use tables, and dimensional regulations. Additionally, examine how applications of the relevant building codes may affect the viability of these housing types.

Housing Strategy 2.e. Use the Land Capacity Analysis to ensure zoned capacity is available for middle housing types in unincorporated urban growth areas where housing growth is anticipated. Specific tools may include lifting density minimums or maximums or establishing density bonuses when middle housing types are proposed.

Housing Goal 3. Affordable housing

Increase the supply of affordable housing units through both private and public development.

Housing Policy 3.1. Develop regulatory strategies to incentivize and provide flexibility for the development of affordable and supportive housing, especially housing that is affordable to households making less than 80 percent of the Area Median Income.

Housing Policy 3.2. Pursue new and existing funding opportunities and sources to support the development of additional affordable housing.

Housing Policy 3.3. Mitigate documented displacement impacts occurring as part of the affordable housing development process.

Housing Strategy 3.a. Explore available or surplus County properties for affordable housing wherever possible and appropriate.

Housing Strategy 3.b. Pursue tools to improve and streamline permit review processes, including efforts to reduce permitting timelines, bolster staff capacity for permit and application review, and other improvements to processes related to regulatory predictability.



Housing Goal 4. Preservation of affordable housing inventory

Preserve the existing stock of affordable housing units in the County.

Housing Policy 4.1. Support the preservation of existing subsidized housing units with expiring or expired affordability restrictions that are at risk of being converted to market-rate housing to limit displacement.

Housing Policy 4.2. Coordinate the creation and maintenance of funding opportunities for repairs and upgrades to existing subsidized housing units, especially in areas where subsidized housing units are occupied by historically marginalized populations.

Housing Strategy 4.a. Evaluate adopting an ordinance that would require owners of manufactured home parks to offer the property for sale to the residents as a cooperative prior to being offered for sale on the open market.

Housing Strategy 4.b. In projects requiring an affordable housing component as a condition of approval, longer term for affordability should be promoted e.g., 30 years or more.

Housing Strategy 4.c. Support the establishment of a housing-focused community land trust.



Housing Goal 5. Integrated planning of affordable housing

Integrate affordable housing planning with transportation, workforce development, emergency management, and economic development efforts.

Housing Policy 5.1. Improve consistency between Kitsap County policies and other planning efforts and documents, including the Consolidated Plan, the Kitsap Homeless Housing Plan, Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, the Area Plan on Aging, and others.

Housing Policy 5.2. Cooperate with other jurisdictions and entities to support their efforts to plan for and develop housing, limiting and mitigating displacement in the process.

Housing Strategy 5.a. Conduct regular review and evaluation of County policies, code, and strategic plans to ensure coordination and consistency between planning efforts.

Housing Strategy 5.b. Coordinate with housing authorities and other city and nonprofit agencies to ensure land and services are available countywide for planned affordable housing development.

Housing Strategy 5.c. Track affordable housing development as part of the 5-year review for the Comprehensive Plan to ensure that workforce and economic development efforts and transportation investments are appropriately serving affordable housing developments.

Housing Goal 6. Equitable access to housing

Ensure equitable access to housing, prioritizing efforts to remove disparities in housing access for historically marginalized communities and households that experience disproportionate access barriers.

Housing Policy 6.1. Promote fair housing to ensure that all residents of Kitsap County have an equal and fair opportunity to obtain safe and healthy housing suitable to their needs and financial resources, regardless of race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, national origin, family status, income, disability, or other protected class.

Housing Policy 6.2. Coordinate with Tribes, jurisdictions, agencies, and community partners to identify and remove local regulatory barriers that limit the provision of a diverse supply of housing units affordable to low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households, especially for populations historically affected by systematic inequities.

Housing Policy 6.3. Encourage affordable housing opportunities to be distributed throughout the County, prioritizing opportunities in historically marginalized communities and areas with a concentration of households making less than 80 percent of the Area Median Income.

Housing Policy 6.4. Increase public awareness of affordable housing opportunities throughout the county, especially for communities facing disproportionate barriers in obtaining information on such opportunities.

Housing Strategy 6.a. Work with Kitsap Transit to ensure that affordable and supported housing is developed with transit access.

Housing Strategy 6.b. Partner with local Tribes, agencies, departments, community organizations, and educational institutions to:

- share and promote public resources for affordable housing opportunities throughout the county.
- produce a report identifying how systematic inequities created, and have maintained, barriers to housing for historically marginalized communities in Kitsap County.
- review and propose amendments to County policies and programs that have maintained barriers to housing for historically marginalized communities in Kitsap County

Housing Strategy 6.c. Update the Fair Housing Plan to improve housing accessibility.

Housing Goal 7. Mitigation of risk of displacement

Ensure equitable treatment for residents currently housed by mitigating harmful practices that may put households at risk of displacement.

Housing Policy 7.1. Collaborate with community organizations and agencies to review and assess the development of tenant protections for residents, especially for those with an increased risk of displacement.

Housing Policy 7.2. Review land surplus and disposal policies, especially for scenarios impacting historically marginalized households.

Housing Strategy 7.a. Coordinate with Tribes, local agencies, organizations representing historically marginalized communities, developers, landlords, and additional partners in the review process of anti-displacement policies to ensure policies limit displacement from the area.

Housing Strategy 7.b Monitor known areas of displacement risk using Puget Sound Regional Council's Displacement Risk Map and integrate into housing planning.



HUMAN SERVICES GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Housing Goal 8. Homelessness

Make homelessness rare, brief, and one-time in Kitsap County

Housing Policy 8.1. Increase opportunities for expanded housing options and supportive services for people in foster care, group homes, emergency housing or shelters, or experiencing homelessness.

Housing Policy 8.2. Identify and remove regulatory barriers to alternative housing models for people experiencing housing insecurity or homelessness.

Housing Policy 8.3. Coordinate Housing Authorities, nonprofit builders, and social services providers to create additional permanent supportive housing units in an effort to meet projected need from the HAPT/Commerce tool and expand service options for Kitsap residents who have significant barriers to independent, stable housing.

Housing Policy 8.4. Support programs and resources for individuals with identities and/or lived experiences that place them at higher risk of experiencing homelessness.

Housing Policy 8.5. Review and update as necessary coordinated planning in partnership with Tribes, jurisdictions, agencies, and community organizations, ensuring communities disproportionately at-risk of or experiencing homelessness are accounted for in the plan.

Housing Policy 8.6. Evaluate and mitigate the impacts of climate change and natural disasters on the county's response to addressing homelessness, including factors like heat events and flooding.

Housing Policy 8.7. Coordinate with Tribes, jurisdictions, agencies, and community organizations the provision of emergency housing and shelters where needed, understanding that emergency needs will vary depending on the impacted individual/s and the situation.

What is Housing First?

Housing First (Housing Strategy 8.a) is a homeless assistance approach that prioritizes providing permanent supportive housing and other housing services to people experiencing homelessness, thus ending their homelessness and serving as a platform from which they can pursue personal goals and improve their quality of life.

It is referred to as "Housing First" because of the principle that housing people who are currently experiencing homelessness can stabilize them and provide a safe environment. Housing is seen as a prerequisite to addressing other needs.

Housing Strategy 8.a. Support a Housing First model for chronically unsheltered individuals.

Housing Strategy 8.b. Coordinate with local schools, colleges, and community organizations to identify and house youth experiencing homelessness, especially youth from historically marginalized communities.

Housing Strategy 8.c. Regularly review and update the Kitsap Homeless Housing Plan to continuously improve and update the County’s approach to homelessness.

Housing Strategy 8.d. Maintain an updated inventory and analysis of emergency housing and emergency shelter capacity and needs in the county, taking into consideration the additional temporary impact of various emergency scenarios.

Housing Strategy 8.e. Support and fund the Coordinated Entry program and service provider and maintenance of the Homelessness Management Information System to ensure equitable access to new and existing housing options for people experiencing homelessness, imminently losing housing, or at risk of homelessness.

Housing Goal 9. Support services

Increase support, referral, and connections to social services

Housing Policy 9.1. Support existing and develop new programs as needed that link human services with housing, especially to limit or mitigate displacement impacts.

Housing Policy 9.2. Ensure all residents have an equal and fair opportunity to access human services, especially services mitigating displacement impacts, regardless of identity or lived experience and ensure services are accessible via reliable public transportation.

Housing Policy 9.3. Collaborate with partner agencies and organizations in providing support to programs that assist low-income seniors, area veterans, students, and residents with disabilities.

Housing Policy 9.4. Coordinate with partner agencies and community organizations to ensure social services for displacement impacts are accessible and readily available for individuals at-risk or experiencing displacement.

Housing Policy 9.5. Support services for the Kitsap area’s underserved youth with job training and placement.

Strategy 9.a. Engage with economic development and workforce organizations to ensure job training and placement programs have the most up-to-date data and are targeted at communities identified as underserved or at risk of displacement.

Strategy 9.b. Incorporate a geographic analysis of underserved communities when making capital program decisions about where human services investments are made.



Strategy 9.c. Ensure that when multimodal level of service decisions are made in the context of transportation planning, human and social services are accessible by all forms of transportation available to residents of Kitsap County.

REFERENCES

- [Establishing Housing Targets \(July 2023\)](#)
- [Kitsap-Bremerton Affordable Housing Study \(March 2020\)](#)
- [Kitsap Count CDBG \(kitsapgov.com\)](#)
- [Coordinated Grant Application Process \(kitsap.gov\)](#)
- [Displacement Risk Mapping | Puget Sound Regional Council \(psrc.org\)](#)
- [Housing First - National Alliance to End Homelessness](#)
- [HH-Homeless-Crisis-Response-and-Housing-Plan \(kitsap.gov\)](#)



SILVERDALE TRANSIT CENTER

CHAPTER 5

Transportation



Chapter 5 / **Transportation Element**

VISION

The County has a transportation vision of a well-maintained, safe, integrated, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that supports the County's population, land use plan, and provides connections within and between communities.

INTENT

The Transportation Goals, Policies, and Implementation Strategies guide preservation, maintenance, planning, and improvements to the County's multi-modal transportation system in Unincorporated Kitsap County. The transportation element includes a current inventory of transportation facilities and programs and ensures the future transportation system is safe, cost effective, sustainable, and accessible for all users.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Washington State Growth Management Act is the framework for all land use planning in the state and lays out the requirements for comprehensive plans and development regulations that implement the plans. The Transportation Element is a required element and must include:

- Land use assumptions used in estimating travel;
- Estimated impacts to state-owned transportation facilities;
- Facilities and services needs, including:
 - Inventory of air, water, and ground transportation;
 - Multimodal level of service standards;
 - Plans for bringing substandard facilities or services to acceptable level of service standards;
 - 10-year demand and need forecasts; and
 - ADA transition plan
- Concurrency strategies
- Consistency with capital facilities plans

The County's policy framework for the Transportation Element Goals and Policies pulls from the Growth Management Act (GMA), Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington (RCW), Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC's) VISION 2050, Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the County's vision.

State and regional guiding directives for this element include:

- Establish a seamless multi-modal regional transportation system through intergovernmental coordination,

- Avoid concentrating people and commercial/industrial uses in environmentally sensitive areas, to minimize need for development of transportation systems in such areas,
- Emphasize moving people rather than vehicles through support of high-capacity transit, and non-motorized facilities.
- Continue to pursue Growth Management Act requirements for Level of Service and Concurrency,
- Maximize the efficiency of existing transportation corridors before creating new ones.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

This Element implements and is consistent with the Land Use Element and other Elements including Economic Development, Environment, Climate Change, Housing and Human Services, Parks and Recreation, and Capital Facilities. The transportation element plans for a transportation system that will support the County's future land use map and implements the land use element.



BACKGROUND

The Kitsap transportation system includes state highways, city and county roads, interchanges and bridges, bikeways and trails, public transportation facilities and services, railroads, marine ports, ferries, and airports. The State, County, municipalities, and special districts share jurisdiction over these facilities.

- The County Road Department maintains over 20,000 signs, 20 miles of guardrails and 915 miles of roadways requiring over 1,600 miles of painted lane stripes.
- The County maintains over 145 miles of on-road non-motorized facilities, and more than 7 miles of off-road non-motorized facilities.
- Kitsap County has 371 miles of water trails.
- The County spends about \$15 Million per year on capital transportation projects identified in the County's Transportation Improvement Program.
- Kitsap Transit operates 37 fixed route buses, 35 worker/driver buses and 4 ferry routes, transporting more than 3.8 million rides a year.
- WA State Ferries operate 4 ferry terminals and transport 8.3 million riders per year.
- There are 103 miles of State highways in Kitsap County.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

KEY TERMS

Complete Streets - a systems approach to planning, designing, building, operating, and maintaining the transportation system that enables safe and convenient access to destinations for all people, including pedestrians, bicyclists, rolling, motorists, freight, and transit riders.

Concurrency - transportation infrastructure and services must be adequate to support land use, with adequacy defined by locally adopted LOS standards, i.e., jurisdictions must adopt LOS standards by which the minimum acceptable roadway operating conditions are defined.

Context Sensitive Design - a collaborative, interdisciplinary project design approach that involves all stakeholders to provide a transportation facility that fits its physical setting and community needs while maintaining safety, mobility, and intent of the transportation system. This approach addresses the total context within which a transportation facility is planned, implemented, maintained, and operated.

Multi-modal - includes pedestrian, bicyclists, rolling, motorist, freight, aviation, marine, and transit modes of transportation, systems, and facilities.

State of Good Repair - the transportation facility is in a condition sufficient for the asset to operate as intended.

Level of service (LOS) - a term used to qualitatively describe the operating condition of a roadway, intersection, other infrastructure, or service.

LOS designations for vehicle travel are qualitative measures of congestion that describe operational conditions within a traffic stream and consider such factors as volume, speed, travel time, and delay. Six letter designations, "A" through "F," are used to define LOS. LOS A represents conditions with the lowest amounts of delay and LOS F indicates that traffic volumes are at a high level of congestion with unstable traffic flow.

Level of Service Standards - evaluate the transportation impacts of long-term growth and to ensure concurrency.

Project Evaluation System - a process used for the selection of transportation improvement projects for funding in the County's six-year TIP program. Prospective projects that are placed into the process are scored and ranked using objective criteria including safety, capacity needs, structural condition, staff availability, and timing of funding and other criteria.

How are transportation projects selected?

Funded transportation projects are kept on a 6-year Transportation Implementation Program, or TIP. The process and criteria for transportation project selection for the TIP are outlined in Kitsap County's Project Evaluation System. This system scores projects on aspects of preservation, capacity, safety, environmental retrofit, and non-motorized travel.

For more information, please see Kitsap County's description of the Project Evaluation System: [Project Evaluation System 2017 \(kitsap.gov\)](https://www.kitsap.gov/transportation/evaluation-system)



Roadway Functional Classification - the role a roadway plays in the multi-modal transportation system. The three major categories of classification are:

- Arterials – supporting higher mobility and lower degree of access to adjacent properties
- Collectors – balancing between mobility and access
- Locals – lower mobility and higher degree of access to adjacent properties

The County uses the Federal Functional Classification (FFC) system for transportation systems planning. A more detailed discussion of FFC can be found in the Capital Facilities Plan.

State Freight and Goods Transportation System - a freight designation system which classifies freight corridors based on annual freight tonnage moved through truck, rail, and waterway freight corridors.

Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) - a six-year transportation construction program to coordinate the County's road and transportation improvements. Public Works updates the TIP annually based on available and projected funding.

Walk, Bike, and Roll - pedestrian mobility including walking or running, the use of a mobility assistive devices such as wheelchairs, bicycles, and small personal devices such as foot scooters or skateboards for transportation and recreation for all ages and abilities.

Table 13. Kitsap County Roadway Level of Service Standards

Functional Classification	Maximum V/C Ratio* / LOS Standard	
	Urban	Rural
Principal Arterial	0.89/D	0.79/C
Minor Arterial	0.89/D	0.79/C
Collector	0.89/D	0.79/C
Minor Collector	0.89/D	0.79/C
Residential/Local	0.79/C	0.79/C

*V/C = the ratio of vehicles to roadway capacity. A more detailed discussion of LOS can be found in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Technical documents used in development of this Transportation Element include the Capital Facilities Plan, transportation system inventory, the Environmental Impact Statement, and a review of changes to the Washington State Growth Management Act since the previous Comprehensive Plan update.

TRANSPORTATION GOALS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

Transportation Goal 1. Sustainable Connections

Provide a well-maintained, safe, integrated, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that supports the County's population, land use plan, and provides connections within and between communities.

Transportation Policy 1.1. Develop multi-modal transportation level of service standards for urban and rural areas to support the associated land uses and facilitate connections within and between communities.

Transportation Policy 1.2. Ensure equitable public participation in multi-modal transportation planning, including the recognition of and minimization of negative impacts to people of color, persons with disabilities, seniors, youth, people with low-incomes, and people with special transportation needs.

Transportation Policy 1.3. Identify the Washington State Department of Transportation's levels of service for State Routes in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Transportation Policy 1.4. Utilize data-driven planning processes to guide multi-modal transportation system planning and programming.

Transportation Policy 1.5. Utilize Complete Streets system design approaches for Urban Growth Areas, sub-area planning, and facility design.

Transportation Policy 1.6. Require adequate location sensitive multi-modal access and connections within the development, with adjacent uses, and to the multi-modal transportation network for new development.

Transportation Policy 1.7. During project identification, scoping, and design utilize context-sensitive design approaches and consider alternative concepts to address unique transportation needs.

Transportation Policy 1.8. Incorporate resiliency designs and redundant access and routes in multi-modal transportation planning and development review.

Transportation Strategy 1.a. Establish multi-modal levels of service for urban and rural areas in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Transportation Strategy 1.b. Maintain the County's Transportation Concurrency program to monitor and review levels of service and address capacity needs in the multi-modal transportation system during planning, implementation, and the development review processes.

Transportation Strategy 1.c. Identify and address capacity deficiencies in terms of identified funding, adjustment to the level of service standard, or placing restrictions on development



(e.g., modifications to or denial of permit applications, or in extreme circumstances, a temporary moratorium on development).

Transportation Strategy 1.d. Maintain system, subarea, and intersection level traffic modeling capability to analyze and assess system level of service and operations.

Transportation Strategy 1.e. Monitor and review State Route levels of service to support concurrency review and the land use plan.

Transportation Strategy 1.f. Utilize the policy-based and data-driven Public Works Transportation Project Evaluation System's candidate project analysis process to support project selection for the Transportation Improvement Program.

Transportation Strategy 1.g. Within Urban Growth Areas, centers, and sub-areas use the Transportation Implementation Strategy process specific to those areas to prioritize system improvements and to inform the Transportation Improvement Program.

Transportation Strategy 1.h. Monitor and refine as necessary the Federal Functional Classification designations of County roads to support connections within and between communities.

Transportation Strategy 1.i. Periodically review the County Road Design Standards and sub-area plans to ensure compatibility and support for Complete Streets system design.

Transportation Strategy 1.j. Use the development review process to analyze, assess, and condition developments to incorporate appropriate multi-modal access and connections.

Transportation Strategy 1.k. Identify and mitigate potential health, safety, capacity, multi-modal access, environmental, social, economic, and other impacts which may result from public or private development during the State Environmental Policy Act review process.

Transportation Strategy 1.l. Promote public involvement by engaging a broad spectrum of individuals, historically underserved people and communities, and community advisory committees, in systems and project planning and implementation processes.

Transportation Goal 2. Maintenance and Operations

Maintain, preserve, and operate the County's multi-modal transportation infrastructure in a State of Good Repair.

Transportation Policy 2.1. Sustain the County's asset management program to manage multi-modal transportation assets.

Transportation Policy 2.2. Proactively manage the multi-modal transportation system's risk exposure to natural and human-caused hazards and increase resiliency of the system.

Transportation Policy 2.3. Emphasize maintenance, operations, and preservation of arterial and collector transportation facilities.

Transportation Policy 2.4. Within the County’s asset management system and operations procedures, emphasize maintaining County levels of service standards and resources to the arterial and collector classified facilities.

Transportation Policy 2.5. Control and minimize access points on arterial and collector facilities.

Transportation Policy 2.6. Address resiliency to natural and human-caused hazards through project design, improvements, preservation activities, and operational procedures.

Transportation Strategy 2.a. Continue to update, expand, and refine the County’s asset management program to manage the County’s multi-modal transportation system in a State of Good Repair.

Transportation Strategy 2.b. Continue to refine and document the nature and scope of potential natural and human-caused hazards to the multi-modal transportation system in the County’s asset management program; provide for vulnerability assessment of transportation systems.

Transportation Strategy 2.c. Continue to use best available science to update, expand, and refine the County’s asset management program to manage culvert maintenance activities and remediation of fish barriers within the County’s multi-modal transportation system with an emphasis on the arterial and collector transportation facilities.

Transportation Strategy 2.d. During project design and development review minimize access points on arterial and collector roads.

Transportation Goal 3. Safety

Improve safety outcomes of the multi-modal transportation system.

Transportation Policy 3.1. Reduce transportation-related deaths and serious injury crashes to support Washington’s Target Zero objectives, and the Safe System Approach.

Transportation Policy 3.2. Coordinate with school districts to identify and address transportation safety concerns and solutions near schools.

Transportation Policy 3.3. Utilize County-specific crash data and analytical process from the County’s Safety Action Plan to identify safety concerns and prioritize projects to address safety needs.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Transportation Strategy 3.a. Sustain safety review and analysis of the multi-modal transportation system in the County’s Comprehensive Safety Action Plan to support project selection and project design processes.



Transportation Strategy 3.b. Incorporate school-specific safety analysis and solutions into the County's Comprehensive Safety Action Plan which address the County's multi-modal system and school districts' transportation management policies and facilities.

Transportation Strategy 3.c. Where possible separate non-motorized users from the roadway through the use of separated paths, landscaping, and other new or creative solutions that provide safe and efficient ways to walk, bike, and roll.

Transportation Goal 4. Complete Streets

Incorporate a Complete Streets systems approach to walking, biking, and rolling systems and facilities design to support all ages and abilities access, safety, and connectivity within and between communities.

Transportation Policy 4.1. Within Urban Growth Areas, centers, and sub-areas, walk, bike, and roll facilities will emphasize access for all ages and abilities, safety, and providing access to and linking land uses and activity areas within and between communities, public facilities, parks, and open space.

Transportation Policy 4.2. Address existing mobility barriers in the public rights-of-way as identified in the County's Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan.

Transportation Policy 4.3. Maximize the opportunities for walking, biking, and rolling for transportation, recreation, and health within new and existing public and private development through the provision of integrated walk, bike, and roll facilities within the development, connecting to adjacent properties, and accessing the multi-modal transportation system.

Transportation Policy 4.4. Walk, bike, and roll facilities in Rural areas which provide connections between and within communities, parks, and open space will emphasize an all ages and abilities accessibility.

Transportation Strategy 4.a. Ensure Urban Growth Area and sub-area planning incorporate a Complete Streets system approach for walking, biking, and rolling facilities and networks within and between communities and centers.

Transportation Strategy 4.b. Develop a walk, bike, and roll facilities plan and identify the community connections system and how it relates to the County Road Design Standards.

Transportation Strategy 4.c. Continue implementation of the County's Americans with Disabilities Act Transition Plan through specific project implementation, and incorporation into capital projects.

Transportation Strategy 4.d. When implementing walk, ride, and roll plans within Urban Growth Areas and sub-areas emphasize continuous connections within community service areas and between residential, commercial, and recreational uses to maximize opportunities to utilize alternative transportation options for daily activities.

Transportation Strategy 4.e. During public and private project development review, condition development to support implementation of walking, biking, and rolling facilities that incorporate a Complete Streets system approach, connections within the community, and emphasized access for all ages and abilities.

Transportation Goal 5. Freight Mobility

Ensure the County's multi-modal transportation system supports freight movements.

Transportation Policy 5.1. Support the State Freight and Goods Transportation System freight classification and Complete Streets system design approaches.

Transportation Strategy 5.a. Coordinate with the Washington State Department of Transportation and businesses to maintain the State Freight and Goods Transportation System Classification.

Transportation Strategy 5.b. Coordinate with the Department of Defense to maintain needed freight and goods movement and access to Naval Base Kitsap while minimizing community impacts from freight and goods movement.

Transportation Strategy 5.c. Coordinate with other jurisdictions including Department of Defense, Washington State Department of Transportation, Washington State Legislature, Governor, Congress, and Tribes to expedite capacity and safety improvements to SR 3 and SR 16 in Gorst to support freight mobility and national defense.

Transportation Strategy 5.d. Monitor and evaluate impacts to the multi-modal transportation system from local freight and parcel delivery.

Transportation Goal 6. Airports

Preserve the County's existing aviation facilities.

Transportation Policy 6.1. Coordinate with aviation services providers and the community to maintain an air transportation system appropriate to the needs of the County and which is compatible with County land uses.

Transportation Policy 6.2. Explore creation and expansion of commercial airline service in Kitsap County.

Transportation Strategy 6.a. Coordinate with the Port of Bremerton and other airport operators to support aviation access to the County and address impacts to the community with existing aviation activities and potential impacts of growth.

Transportation Strategy 6.b. Promote the Bremerton National Airport as an option for regional commercial airline service.



Transportation Goal 7. Public Transit

Ensure Public Transit supports access within and between County communities and is a viable transportation alternative to support peoples' daily needs and the County's land uses, reducing per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT).

Transportation Policy 7.1. Ensure public transit services within the Urban Growth Areas and sub-areas have routing, frequencies, and levels of service to promote public transit as a viable alternative for daily transportation needs within and between communities and centers.

Transportation Policy 7.2. Ensure that Express and Bus Rapid Transit services providing services between communities and centers are routed through and provide direct access to major destinations within the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and East Bremerton Urban Growth Areas.

Transportation Policy 7.3. Provide public transit services to rural areas to provide practical transportation alternatives.

Transportation Policy 7.4. Support Transportation Demand Management and multi-modal transportation.

Transportation Strategy 7.a. Work with Kitsap Transit to plan and implement fixed route and on-call transit services within Urban Growth Areas and subareas with routing, frequencies, and level of service to support use of transit within the community for daily transportation needs.

Transportation Strategy 7.b. Work with Kitsap Transit to plan and implement Express and Bus Rapid Transit services to support user access within the Urban Growth Areas and between communities and centers.

Transportation Strategy 7.c. Work with Kitsap Transit to plan and implement public transit options in the rural areas which balance access within the rural areas and connections between communities.

Transportation Strategy 7.d. Work with Kitsap Transit to support the Worker Driver commuter program in rural areas.

Transportation Strategy 7.e. Support incentive-based Transportation Demand Management that provides options in transportation modes, e.g., transit pass subsidies, bike lockers, preferential carpool parking, etc.

Transportation Strategy 7.f. Explore the feasibility of expanding the interlocal ferry system to other Kitsap County locations.

Transportation Goal 8. Environmental Protection

Avoid first, minimize second, and then mitigate negative environmental impacts from improvements to the multi-modal transportation system.

Transportation Policy 8.1. Plan, locate, design, and operate transportation facilities to minimize negative environmental impacts.

Transportation Policy 8.2. Plan for resiliency within the multi-modal transportation system to minimize and/or mitigate the impacts of climate change, extreme weather events, and natural or human-caused hazards.

Transportation Policy 8.3. Utilize Best Management Practices in planning and design of systems and facilities.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Transportation Strategy 8.a. During project identification, scoping, and design, utilize context-sensitive design approaches and consider alternative project designs and solutions to address unique environmental conditions associated with a multi-modal transportation facility.

Transportation Strategy 8.b. Identify potential environmental impacts which may result from public or private development during the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review and mitigate the on-site and off-site impacts as part of the development permit application approval process.

Transportation Strategy 8.c. Minimize impervious surfaces where feasible and retain or utilize native vegetation where possible when implementing multi-modal transportation projects.

Transportation Goal 9. Funding

Ensure County multi-modal transportation revenue levels are sufficient to provide a well-maintained, safe, efficient, integrated, and sustainable multi-modal transportation system that supports the people, County's land use plan, and provides connections within and between communities.

Transportation Policy 9.1. County transportation funding, predominantly received from revenue sources in the unincorporated County, can only be utilized for the primary benefit of the land uses and population of those areas.

Transportation Policy 9.2. Ensure County transportation revenue levels are sufficient to maintain, preserve, and operate the County's multi-modal transportation infrastructure in a State of Good Repair.

Transportation Policy 9.3. Seek grant funding and partnership agreements that support implementation of the Transportation Improvement Program.

Transportation Policy 9.4. Sustain the Transportation Impact Fee program at a level sufficient to generate a proportionate share of the cost of new transportation improvement projects needed to serve new growth and development.



Transportation Policy 9.5. Emphasize County levels of service and resources to arterial and collector transportation facilities.

Transportation Policy 9.6. Use the County's Impact Fee Service Area approach to ensure impact fees are spent within the area in which it was generated.

Transportation Policy 9.7. Prioritize investments in designated regional and countywide centers, consistent with regional policy.

Transportation Strategy 9.a. Continue to update, expand, and refine the County's asset management program to manage the County's multi-modal transportation system in a State of Good Repair. Identify trends in revenue sources, costs, and program needs and ensure the program is sufficiently funded.

Transportation Strategy 9.b. Seek grant and partnership opportunities that support the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and delivery schedule.

Transportation Strategy 9.c. Monitor and adjust the Transportation Impact Fee program as needed.

Transportation Goal 10. Interjurisdictional Coordination

Coordinate multi-modal transportation planning with cities, transit, Washington State Department of Transportation, Ports, Health District, adjacent Counties, Navy, and Tribes to establish and maintain an effective transportation system for Kitsap County.

Transportation Policy 10.1. Advocate for regional planning and funding to implement the County's multi-modal transportation system in federal, regional, statewide, and national multi-modal planning, public-private-partnerships, and grant funding processes.

Transportation Policy 10.2. Advocate for equitable access to regional, state, and federal grant processes and proportionate award of grant funding to support the County's multi-modal transportation system.

Transportation Policy 10.3. Work with the Washington State Department of Transportation to research, analyze, and implement solutions to impacts from service interruptions to communities and County facilities from State Routes and Washington State Ferries.

Transportation Policy 10.4. Continue to participate in efforts to engage and support inter-jurisdictional cooperation to provide all the county's residents a safe, efficient, and reliable transportation network for all modes of travel.

Transportation Strategy 10.a. Allocate staff and resources to support the County's representation at the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council, Puget Sound Regional Council, Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization, as well as with the State, local cities, Kitsap Transit, Ports, other agencies, and Tribal planning processes to ensure regional and local plans support the County's land uses, growth, and multi-modal transportation planning.

Transportation Strategy 10.b. Work with the Washington State Department of Transportation, State Legislature, and Governor to identify, fund, and implement State Route segment and intersection improvements to address safety, capacity, and multi-modal connectivity on State Routes.

Transportation Strategy 10.c. Work with the Washington State Department of Transportation to ensure Urban Growth Area and sub-area state planning, projects, and development review address the community's need for walking, biking, and rolling within a Complete Streets system approach.

Transportation Strategy 10.d. Work with the Washington State Department of Transportation and Kitsap Transit to identify, fund, and implement solutions to mitigate ferry traffic related impacts to County communities and facilities.

Transportation Strategy 10.e. Work with local Tribes to plan, fund, and implement multi-modal transportation solutions within and in support of their respective reservations.

Transportation Strategy 10.f. Work with federal, state, local and Tribal jurisdictions to mitigate inter-jurisdictional traffic impacts as the county grows.

REFERENCES

- [Transportation Improvement Program](#)
- [Capital Facilities Plan](#)
- [Non-motorized Facility Plan](#)
- [Transportation Project Evaluation System](#)
- [Road Design Standards](#)
- [Comprehensive Safety Action Plan](#)





SUQUAMISH PARK

CHAPTER 6

Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element

Chapter 6 / **Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Element**

VISION

The County's vision for parks is to create a thriving and accessible park system that meets the diverse needs and interests of the community. The park system offers recreational opportunities and the preservation and stewardship of natural resources. This vision recognizes the County's vital role in providing outdoor recreation areas and facilities that contribute to the overall quality of life for its residents and aims to ensure equitable access to parks for all community members.

In partnership with other agencies and organizations, the County envisions enhancing its park facilities, developing new parks, and creating multi-functional corridors that integrate recreational opportunities and wildlife habitat connectivity, while emphasizing the importance of sustainable land management that promotes environmental protection and climate resilience within the park system.

INTENT

This element of the Comprehensive Plan serves as a reference and foundation for future updates of the County's Parks, Recreation, and Open Space (PROS) Plan. This element provides an outlook for the County's park system, identifying areas for improvement and presenting innovative approaches based on public input and community engagement. To make these aspirations actionable, the next update of PROS Plan (anticipated to be complete in 2024) will implement the goals, policies, and strategies in this element, detailing specific projects, initiatives, and timelines for park development and enhancement. It will identify opportunities for partnerships and funding and foster collaboration with stakeholders to ensure equitable access, environmental stewardship, and diverse recreational opportunities for the community.

The goals and policies in this element recognize County residents' interests in promoting pedestrian use, bicycling, and accessibility through the provision of trails in park system as well as the desire to institute management programs for habitat value, forest health, groundwater recharge, water quality, climate resiliency, and safety.

Technical documents used in development of this Element include an inventory of current parks facilities, level of service standards, and other requirements outlined in the Capital Facilities Plan, the Environmental Impact Statement, the Washington State Growth Management Act, and the Washington Administrative Code.



GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Washington State Growth Management Act is the framework for all land use planning in the state and lays out the requirements for comprehensive plans and development regulations that implement the plans. The Parks and Recreation Element is a required element and must include:

- Estimates of park and recreation demand for at least a ten-year period;
- Evaluation of facilities and service needs;
- Evaluation of tree canopy coverage within the urban growth area; and
- Evaluation of intergovernmental coordination opportunities to provide regional approaches for meeting park and recreational demand.

By aligning with the Growth Management Act (GMA) and the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), this element will provide a comprehensive and visionary framework for the parks, recreation, and open space system. In some cases, the County's PROS plan provides additional information related to GMA requirements for this element.

This work must also align with regional strategies including Vision 2050 and the Regional Open Space Conservation Plan. These plans aim to protect and enhance a diverse range of public and private open spaces, including urban and rural areas, to provide essential economic, recreational, cultural, aesthetic, and ecological services. These plans emphasize equitable access to open spaces and, to achieve this, propose strategies like integrating open space conservation into planning at all levels, protecting critical habitats, enhancing urban open spaces, building a regional trail network, and restoring high-value habitat areas.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Additionally, the plans emphasize the need for coordination among agencies and organizations and the promotion of the many benefits of green infrastructure to support mental and physical health, recreational opportunities, habitat preservation, and stormwater management.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

The goals and policies in this element are an integral part of other elements including *Land Use, Economic Development, Environment, Housing and Human Services, Transportation, Climate Change and Capital Facilities and Utilities*.

- Focusing on the inter-related nature of Parks, Recreation, and Open Space to other Comprehensive Plan elements, this element provides the guidance to do the following:

- Provide parks, recreation, and open space facilities and services in an efficient and economical manner;
- Manage and maintain parks, recreation facilities, and open space lands;
- Work with cities and other communities for park and open space acquisition projects;
- Incorporate a network of trails and greenways throughout the County to connect population and employment centers, schools, and public facilities;
- Manage parks when in proximity to new and existing housing;
- Manage parks and open space properties for environmental values;
- Establish and maintain level of service standards for parkland acreage, equitable access, distribution, function, and maintenance and operations;
- Engage underrepresented communities, including historically underserved groups, low-income populations, and individuals with disabilities, to ensure their access and meaningful participation in park activities;
- Move towards identifying and categorizing lands within Kitsap County Parks for potential future development and restoration efforts;
- Attempt to segregate natural resource protection lands from active/passive recreation elements within each park facility; and
- Ensure park, recreation, and open space acquisition, facility development, and management is balanced with the required funding and operational budget.

BACKGROUND

Kitsap County is known for its many distinctive features including its glacier-carved rolling topography, evergreen forests, freshwater lakes, inlets, bays, and Puget Sound. Kitsap County's nature-oriented park system reflects this diversity of settings and provides for developed recreation facilities to serve a population of diverse ages, ethnicities, abilities, and outdoor interests.

Kitsap County's Park system is a comprehensive network comprised of various park types, collectively totaling 10,843 acres. This diverse range of parks includes heritage parks, waterways and waterfront parks, community recreation complexes, legacy parks, special use parks, and open spaces and greenbelts. Each park type offers distinct recreational opportunities, such as natural landscapes, access to water bodies, community gathering spaces, and areas of historical and cultural significance. The inclusion of this wide variety of park types ensures that the park system caters to the diverse interests and needs of the community while promoting equitable access to nature, recreation, and cultural experiences throughout Kitsap County.

Nearly three quarters of all park and open space acreage lies within six heritage parks that have become the cornerstone of Kitsap County's Park system. A balanced approach that takes into



consideration established levels of service, protection of critical areas, historic and cultural values, equitable and inclusive access, and recreation services for the public will be critical to the success of these heritage parks and the park system overall.

Equally critical is both the long- and short-term stewardship of these lands by the community and County staff, promoting landscapes that endure as legacies for future generations. Through responsible management and preservation practices, these landscapes will remain vibrant and sustainable over time. This stewardship entails adopting strategies that promote health and wellness for the community, recognizing the role of parks in fostering physical activity, mental well-being, and connection with nature.

As the challenges posed by climate change increase, it becomes imperative to adapt parks to the changing climate conditions. This includes integrating resilient design principles, implementing sustainable green infrastructure, and supporting habitats that can withstand the impacts of climate change.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

KEY TERMS

ADA Standards - Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards ensure that public facilities and amenities are accessible to individuals with disabilities.

Climate Resilience - the capacity of natural areas and recreational facilities to withstand, adapt to, and recover from the impacts of climate change including the ability to withstand extreme weather events, rising temperatures, changes in precipitation patterns, and other climate-related challenges while maintaining functionality and benefits for the community.

Critical Areas - areas identified as: (a) wetlands; (b) critical aquifer recharge areas; (c) fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas; (d) geologically hazardous areas; and (e) frequently flooded areas.

Equitable Access - ensuring that all members of a community, regardless of their background, socioeconomic status, age, ability, or location, have fair and inclusive opportunities to access and enjoy parks and recreational facilities. It involves providing equal access to safe, well-maintained, and culturally relevant park spaces, programs, and amenities, fostering a sense of belonging and promoting social, physical, and mental well-being for all individuals within the community.

Green Infrastructure - includes a wide array of natural assets and built structures, such as parks and stormwater management facilities, at multiple scales that manage wet weather and that maintain and restore natural hydrology.

Level of service (LOS) - the specific criteria and standards used to measure and evaluate the adequacy and quality of park facilities, services, and amenities provided to the community. It is a measurable representation of the level of recreational opportunities and resources available to residents and visitors within a defined area and time frame.

Public Private Partnership - a collaborative arrangement between a government and private entities to jointly plan, develop, operate, or manage parks and recreational facilities. These partnerships leverage the resources, expertise, and capabilities of both sectors to enhance the quality, accessibility, and sustainability of parks and recreational amenities for the community's benefit.

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) - a land use planning strategy that allows for the transfer of development rights from one area (typically rural or environmentally sensitive) to another area (usually urban or designated for higher-density development). In this program, landowners in the sending areas, where development is restricted or limited, can sell their development rights to developers or landowners in the receiving areas, where increased development density or intensity is desired.

Universal Design Principles - a set of seven principles and associated guidelines developed in 1997 by a working group of architects, product designers, engineers, and environmental design researchers. These principles are, in brief: equitable use; flexibility in use; simple and intuitive use; perceptible information; tolerance for error; low physical effort; and size and space for approach and use.



PARKS, RECREATION, AND OPEN SPACE GOALS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES

Parks Goal 1. Equity

Provide equitable access to regional parks and open space to meet the recreational and diverse user needs for active healthy communities.

- Parks Policy 1.1.** Develop Park facilities to accommodate specialized activities, large special events, and athletic tournaments to meet current and future demand.
- Parks Policy 1.2.** Develop and upgrade sport field complexes to meet the needs of organized recreation activities, using public and private partnerships where possible.
- Parks Policy 1.3.** Restore, manage, and protect the natural and cultural resources within Kitsap County Parks for the benefit of the greater community and for future generations to safely enjoy.
- Parks Policy 1.4.** Ensure geographic distribution and equitable access to park facilities.
- Parks Policy 1.5.** Develop and redevelop County parks to provide equity of service and activities offered for all demographics and accessibility levels.
- Parks Policy 1.6.** Limit impacts to vulnerable and underserved populations when locating park facilities.
- Parks Policy 1.7.** Maintain and enhance a balance between the economic benefits of tourism and the local quality of life.
- Parks Policy 1.8.** Design and develop facilities that will encourage tourism.
- Parks Policy 1.9.** Develop and redevelop certain County parks and the Fairgrounds and Events Center to become “destination facilities”.
- Parks Policy 1.10.** Coordinate regional parks development and operation with regional trails and other trail systems.
- Parks Policy 1.11.** Implement universal design principles in park planning and development to ensure that park amenities and facilities are accessible to individuals of all ages and abilities.
- Parks Policy 1.12.** Offer a diverse range of cultural programming and events within parks that celebrate the community's various cultural traditions and preferences, fostering a sense of belonging and cultural appreciation.

Parks Strategy 1.a. Carefully consider the acquisition of lands with characteristics that offer opportunities for diverse recreational uses while ensuring adequate resources are available to maintain and operate these facilities into the future.

Parks Strategy 1.b. Create new and foster current partnerships with local, state, and federal government agencies and organizations.

Parks Strategy 1.c. Continue to support and maintain the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board to include community involvement and conduct public outreach.

Parks Strategy 1.d. Work with qualified tourism and business entities to consider and identify current and future opportunities for public access to natural recreation assets and potential economic benefits that align with County goals and policies.

Parks Strategy 1.e. Enhance the Port Gamble Heritage Park Framework with additional environmental and wildlife habitat assessments before planning new major projects within the Park.

Parks Strategy 1.f. Implement strategies from the Non-Motorized Facility Plan when investing in the development and maintenance of the park system.

Parks Strategy 1.g. Collaborate with transportation agencies to improve public transportation connections to parks, ensuring that individuals without private vehicles have safe and reliable access to recreational opportunities.

Parks Strategy 1.h. Develop Park funding allocation criteria in a manner that prioritizes and supports projects aimed at enhancing park accessibility and inclusivity, ensuring equitable distribution of resources throughout the community.

Parks Goal 2. Funding

Provide appropriate and necessary funding and resources to support the management and maintenance of parks, facilities, and open space lands of the highest quality possible.

Parks Policy 2.1. Establish stable funding sources to support the County's parks system.

Parks Policy 2.2. Facilitate partnerships with community organizations, businesses, non-profits, and other government organizations to promote and maintain parks facilities and open space to help offset expense burdens.

Parks Policy 2.3. Encourage the development of multi-use indoor activity centers, through public/private partnerships where possible, to provide year-round recreational opportunities, meeting the needs of the population.

Parks Policy 2.4. Design and develop recreational facilities that require limited maintenance.

Parks Policy 2.5. Explore and implement innovative funding and operational methodologies to effectively manage, provide, and enhance quality parks, recreation, and open space experiences, opportunities, and facilities.

Parks Policy 2.6. Establish necessary staffing levels to support the growing needs of the Parks Department.



Parks Policy 2.7. Invest in upgrades to existing facilities to bring them up to Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

Parks Policy 2.8. Develop and redevelop County parks to accommodate the preferences and needs of all visitors and residents with particular attention to historically marginalized, elderly, persons with disabilities, young, and low-income populations.

Parks Policy 2.9. Develop and redevelop County parks in a manner that allows all-weather activity where feasible.

Parks Policy 2.10. Provide visitor accommodations including trailheads, parking, and restrooms where needed, appropriate, and as funds allow.

Parks Policy 2.11. Recognize parks as an important component of Kitsap County's economy, climate resiliency, and quality of life.

Parks Policy 2.12. Integrate sustainable practices in park management and maintenance to reduce operational costs and minimize the environmental impact of park facilities.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Parks Strategy 2.a. Implement the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan to strategically acquire and develop open space, greenways, and wildlife habitat using allocated funds to ensure responsible and sustainable growth.

Parks Strategy 2.b. Provide dedicated funding for parks projects and efforts and to establish a formal, ongoing capital maintenance and improvement program (e.g., countywide metropolitan parks district).

Parks Strategy 2.c. Form partnerships with community groups to maintain natural areas and trails collaboratively and effectively.

Parks Strategy 2.d. Encourage homeowner associations and property owners to work with parks agencies and land trusts to effectively maintain buffers and open space within and around developments.

Parks Strategy 2.e. Prioritize sustainability in all aspects of park planning, development, and maintenance, emphasizing resource efficiency, water conservation, carbon reduction, waste reduction, and environmental awareness.

Parks Goal 3. Efficiency

Establish a land acquisition strategy, including the necessary funding, that will facilitate a more efficient service delivery model.

Parks Policy 3.1. Prioritize the acquisition of trail corridors that connect parks, schools, residential, and urban areas where financially feasible.

Parks Policy 3.2. Integrate reusable grey water in parks, golf courses, and other high use public facilities when feasible.

Parks Policy 3.3. Utilize low impact development techniques within Kitsap County Parks when practical.

Parks Policy 3.4. Coordinate with Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, as needed, for the development of trails in rural areas through acquisitions or easements under the TDR program.

Parks Strategy 3.a. Develop a land acquisition evaluation method to ensure new properties meet specific criteria such as proximity to urban growth areas, multi-functional corridors, climate resilience, cultural significance, equitable access, and achieve desired goals.

Parks Strategy 3.b. Purchase lands along the lower main stem of Chico Creek Watershed as recommended in the Chico Creek Main Stem Restoration Plan.

Parks Goal 4. Water Access

Provide physical and visual public access opportunities and space for diverse forms of water-oriented recreation in such a way that private property rights, public safety, and shoreline ecological functions and processes are protected in accordance with existing laws and statutes.

Parks Policy 4.1. Support and promote the Kitsap Peninsula Water Trail.

Kitsap Peninsula Water Trail

[Kitsap Peninsula Water Trail](#), a celebrated segment of the Cascadia Marine Trail, opens over 350 miles of saltwater shoreline on western Puget Sound and Hood Canal to modern day exploration. Kitsap is a destination because of its unique marine environments, natural scenic beauty of mountains and sound, migrating marine mammal populations, and friendly and inviting ports and towns steeped in tradition.

(Source: Washington Water Trails Association)



Parks Policy 4.2. Prioritize acquisition of properties that provide access to public tidelands to maximize public access.

Parks Policy 4.3. Ensure waterfront facilities and infrastructure are designed to accommodate people of all ages, abilities, and mobility levels.

Parks Policy 4.4. Consider ranges of compatible uses in our regional parks.

Parks Strategy 4.a. Identify and consider opportunities to increase public access and foster environmental and economic benefits associated with Kitsap Peninsula Water Trails and designation as part of the National Water Trails System.

Parks Strategy 4.b. Conduct accessibility assessments of waterfront facilities and implement improvements, such as accessible pathways, ramps, and seating areas, to ensure equitable access for individuals with diverse mobility needs.

Parks Strategy 4.c. Prioritize ecological restoration efforts and adopt best management practices to protect shoreline ecosystems and promote habitat conservation while accommodating water-oriented recreation.

Parks Goal 5. Environmental Compatibility

Provide regional parks and open space for passive recreation that preserves the ecological needs of wildlife.

Parks Policy 5.1. Support development of a regional trail system throughout the County and recognize that trails, when built, must be sensitive to the impact on the natural environment.

Parks Policy 5.2. Incorporate the Local Habitat Assessment completed by Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife to assist in identifying crucial corridor areas that may not necessarily be identified in the Shoreline Master Program or the Critical Areas Ordinance.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Parks Policy 5.3. When implementing the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan, ensure that coordination with local Tribes and other relevant stakeholders occurs to ensure protection of treaty reserved natural and cultural resources.

Parks Policy 5.4. Kitsap County’s Parks Department will strive to limit conflict between wildlife and humans and decrease impact on habitat by improving identification of protected areas using the Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program as an information source.

Parks Policy 5.5. Prioritize redevelopment of existing impacted areas over disturbing undeveloped areas.

Parks Policy 5.6. Kitsap County Parks Department will continue to improve educational efforts and signage regarding the importance of limiting contact with wildlife and the value of habitat preservation.

Parks Policy 5.7. Mitigate tree canopy cover loss due to increased development while striving to utilize best forest management practices in restoring areas to maintain green space, enhance carbon sequestration, and mitigate GHG emissions within Kitsap County Parks.

Parks Policy 5.8. Locate and design trail corridors to also serve wildlife when possible.

Parks Policy 5.9. Ensure that the County’s Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan is consistent with habitat inventories, habitat protection, restoration programs, natural resource management policies, and County code.

Parks Policy 5.10. Incorporate climate resilience principles into park and open space management plans, using adaptive management strategies to monitor and respond to climate-related changes.

Parks Policy 5.11. Private properties bordering or adjacent to county parks shall have no legal access to the park from their private property. Only County designated and approved access points will be used for all park visitors.

Parks Strategy 5.a. Educate residents on natural resources, forest stewardship, wildlife, and forest ecology, including native flora and fauna indigenous to the Pacific Northwest.

Parks Strategy 5.b. Identify both acquisition and preservation opportunities for open space in rural areas.

Parks Strategy 5.c. Identify, assess, and prioritize parks resource areas for their suitability for recreational uses and needs for habitat restoration or preservation, utilizing the Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program as a tool.

Parks Strategy 5.d. Develop individual forest management plans for regional and heritage parks.

Parks Strategy 5.e. Develop a climate sustainability and resiliency management plan for Parks-owned properties.

Parks Strategy 5.f. Identify and designate specific areas within regional parks and open spaces that serve as multi-functional corridors, integrating both recreational opportunities and wildlife habitat connectivity.



REFERENCES

- [Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Framework](#)
- Chico Creek Main Stem Restoration Plan
- [Kitsap Peninsula Water Trail](#)
- [Shoreline Master Program](#)
- [Critical Areas Ordinance](#)
- [Transfer of Development Rights](#)
- [Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management](#)
- [Parks, Recreation, and Open Space \(PROS\) Plan](#)



KITSAP COUNTY ROAD DEPARTMENT

CHAPTER 7

Capital Facilities and Utilities Element



Chapter 7 / **Capital Facilities and Utilities Element**

VISION

Kitsap County has a vision that public services and facilities are provided in an efficient, high-quality, and timely manner by the County and partner agencies. Public services and facilities are monitored, maintained, and enhanced to meet level of service standards.

INTENT

The Capital Facilities and Utilities Element guides planning, funding, and project decisions for unincorporated Kitsap County. With rapid population growth in the county, guidance to plan for sufficient capital facilities and utilities is crucial. The goals, policies, and strategies within this element direct the County and utility providers to stay updated on facility levels and demands in order to meet specific level of service standards and forecasted future needs for public facilities laid out in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Kitsap County chose to combine the Capital Facilities and Utilities Elements together to show how these elements build off each other and create a shared responsibility between County service providers and non-County providers. This shared duty allows the County to create well-coordinated and proactive planning measures that address current and future facility, utility, and service needs.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT AND REGIONAL COORDINATION

The County's policy framework for the Capital Facilities and Utilities Element Goals and Policies pulls from the Growth Management Act (GMA), Chapter 36.70A Revised Code of Washington (RCW), Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC's) VISION 2050, Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and the County's vision.

The Capital Facilities and Utilities elements are two separate elements required under Washington's Growth Management Act. Each element has a unique purpose and set of requirements; however, the two elements share similarities in ways that make addressing them together particularly valuable in ensuring sufficient facilities and utilities are planned to meet population growth for the County.

Capital Facilities GMA Requirements (RCW 36.70A.070(3)):

- an inventory of existing facilities owned by public entities, showing their locations and capacities;
- a forecast of the future needs;
- the proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities;

- at least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes; and
- reassessment of the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.

Utilities GMA Requirements (RCW 36.70A.070(4)):

- include the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication service, and natural gas lines.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

Capital Facilities and Utilities goals and policies in this Comprehensive Plan are an integral part of the other elements, including Land Use, Climate Change, Economic Development, Environment, Housing and Human Services, Parks and Recreation, and Transportation. Public services and facilities include, but are not limited to, parks and recreation, law enforcement, fire protection, emergency preparedness,



water/sewer, roads, transit, walk, bike, and roll facilities, ferries, stormwater management, education, library services, health and human services, energy, and telecommunications.

BACKGROUND

Technical documents used in development of this Element include an inventory of current public capital facilities, level of service standards and concurrency requirements outlined in the Capital Facilities Plan, the Environmental Impact Statement, the Washington State Growth Management Act, and the Washington Administrative Code.

County, city, Tribal, and special districts provide capital facilities for growth in their respective jurisdictions and have contributed to this element of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. The types of capital facilities and services addressed under this element are included in Table 14.

Table 14. Providers by facility type

Capital Facility	Provider(s)
Community Centers	Kitsap County, Cities, Tribes
Corrections Facilities/Law Enforcement	Kitsap County, Tribes
County Buildings	Kitsap County
County Courts (Superior/District)	Kitsap County
Ferries	Washington State, Kitsap Transit
Fire Protection/Emergency Medical Services	Fire Districts
Health and Human Services	Kitsap Public Health District
Hospitals	Virginia Mason Franciscan Health
Libraries	Kitsap Regional Library
Local Roads	Kitsap County
Parks	Kitsap County, Park Districts
State highways	Washington State
Sanitary Sewer	Kitsap County, Districts, Cities
Schools	School Districts
Solid Waste Disposal	Kitsap County
Stormwater Management	Kitsap County, Cities
Telecommunications	Districts, Service Providers
Transit	Kitsap Transit
Water	Districts, Cities
Energy	Puget Sound Energy

KEY TERMS

Concurrency - transportation infrastructure and services must be adequate to support land use, with adequacy defined by locally adopted LOS standards, i.e., jurisdictions must adopt LOS standards by which the minimum acceptable roadway operating conditions are defined.

Essential Public Facilities – those facilities that are typically difficult to site, such as airports, education facilities, transportation facilities, transit facilities, correctional facilities, solid waste facilities, and certain inpatient facilities, such as substance abuse facilities or group homes. The State Office of Financial Management maintains a list of capital projects required or likely to be built in the next six years. Establishment and siting of Essential Public Facilities must be consistent with the GMA provision in RCW 36.70A.200.

Green Infrastructure - a wide array of natural assets and built structures, including parks, stormwater management facilities at multiple scales that manage wet weather and that maintain and restore natural hydrology.

Level of service (LOS) - a term used to qualitatively describe the operating condition of a roadway, intersection, other infrastructure, or service.



CAPITAL FACILITIES AND UTILITIES GOALS, POLICIES, AND STRATEGIES

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 1. Levels of Service

Define types of public facilities and services, establish standards for levels of service, and determine what improvements are needed to achieve and maintain those standards.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 1.1. Coordinate the provision of utilities with future development by designating appropriate sites for utility facilities in a manner that ensures equitable access to all communities and prioritizes addressing disparities for communities that have been historically underserved and disproportionately burdened.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 1.2. Define level of service standards in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 1.a. Work with communities and decision makers, where required, to develop level of service standards for each asset.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 1.b. Measure and monitor levels of service for public facilities and services at regular intervals to ensure the County has the data it needs to make changes in the capital improvement program or to levels of service standards.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 1.c. Use available environmental equity tools (e.g., PSRC's toolkit, Kitsap County's Equity Atlas) to assist in prioritizing investments that address disparities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 2. Essential Public Facilities

Implement a countywide process for siting essential public facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.1. Coordinate with jurisdictions and communities that may be impacted by the siting of essential public facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.2. Essential public capital facilities such as schools and libraries that generate substantial travel demand should first be considered in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) and then, along or near major transportation corridors and public transportation routes.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.3. Public facilities located beyond UGAs should be self-contained or be served by urban governmental services in a manner that will not promote sprawl. Utility and service consideration must be incorporated into site planning and development.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.4. Establish regulations for development that promote sewer connectivity between UGA parcels or tracts.



Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.5. Essential public facilities for sewage disposal shall adhere to local health district and state agency rules regarding commercial and industrial use of on-site sewage systems.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.6. Essential public facilities in designated resource lands, critical areas, or other areas should be carefully considered and other alternatives assessed.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.7. Preserve and promote expansion of access to air transportation facilities in Kitsap County.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.8. Promote the health and safety of the community and airport users through compatible land use planning adjacent to airports.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.9. The siting or expansion of essential public facilities must mitigate its impacts on the environment and public health, prioritizing the minimization of adverse impacts on historically marginalized populations and disproportionately burdened communities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 2.10. Consider the effects of climate change, including enhanced risk from sea level rise, flooding, wildfire, and urban heat island, when evaluating and siting essential public facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 2.a. Develop a process for coordinating with cities, public agencies and special districts, the siting and evaluation of Essential Public Facilities within the county.

This evaluation should consider:

- The impacts created by existing facilities;
- The potential for reshaping the economy, the environment, and community character;
- The development of site-specific siting criteria for the proposed project, giving priority consideration to siting within Centers;
- The identification, analysis, and ranking of potential project sites;
- Measures to first minimize and second mitigate potential physical impacts including but not limited to those relating to land use, natural environment, transportation, utilities, noise, odor, and public health and safety;
- Measures to first minimize and second to mitigate potential fiscal impacts;
- Impacts to historically underserved communities and those facing disproportionate burdens when siting or expanding public facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 2.b. Use health impact assessment, equity, and other tools to evaluate health and other equity impacts to communities when evaluating potential sites for essential public facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 2.c. When completing and implementing plans for designated centers, ensure that important capital facilities that serve new housing and employment growth in the centers can be accommodated within or directly adjacent to those centers.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 3. Concurrency

Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development are adequate to serve that development at the time it is available for occupancy and use without decreasing service levels below locally established minimum standards.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 3.1. Follow the established requirements for concurrency as defined in [WAC 365-196-840](#).

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 3.2. Consider amendments to the Comprehensive Plan if a development is to be denied based on concurrency.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 3.a. Develop concurrency management standards, including timing and costs, for the development review process to provide required services.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 3.b. Identify and address level of service deficiencies in terms of identified funding, adjustment to the level of service standard, or placing conditions on development.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 4. Funding

Ensure adequate public facilities are available by providing needed capital improvements; maintain a financially feasible schedule of capital improvements in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 4.1. Provide public facilities or accept independent public facilities which meet County standards only when the County or other providers can pay for subsequent operating and maintenance costs of the facility.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 4.2. Ensure that existing development funds improvements to address any existing deficiencies in the system.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 4.3. Ensure future development funds its proportionate share of the capital improvements needed to service the increment of new demand it generates and the cost of the replacement of obsolete or worn-out facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 4.4. Ensure that impact fees for future development only fund the impacts of the demand related to it rather than reduce or eliminate existing deficiencies at the time of approval.



Capital Facilities and Utilities

Policy 4.5. Balance limited financial and physical resources with regularly scheduled maintenance and necessary upgrades needed for operation of existing facilities to ensure efficient use.

Capital Facilities and Utilities

Policy 4.6. The estimated costs of all needed capital improvements should not exceed conservative estimates of revenues from sources that are available to the County under current law.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 4.7. Determine priorities between facilities of different types and between facilities of the same type as follows:

- **Use maintenance and funding allocation plans** for capital facilities to prioritize investments in maintenance of existing facilities and revise these plans from time to time. This should include a range of cost estimates in accordance with Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 4.6.
- **Convene representatives** of Public Works, Sheriff, Administration, Community Development, Auditor, and other County Departments/Offices to develop a coordinated set of principles and a process to evaluate and prioritize capital projects, particularly those that share related funding sources. The following interim principals are proposed:
- **Facilities of different types.** Legal restrictions on the use of many revenue sources limit the extent to which types of facilities compete for priority with other types of facilities because they do not compete for the same revenues. All capital improvements that are necessary for achieving and maintaining a standard for levels of service adopted in this Capital Facilities Element are included in the financially feasible schedule of capital improvements contained in the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). The relative priorities among types of public facilities (e.g., roads, sanitary sewer, etc.) were established by adjusting the standards for levels of service and the available revenue until the resulting public facilities needs became financially feasible. This process is repeated with each update of the Kitsap CFP, thus allowing for changes in priorities among types of public facilities.
- **Facilities of the same type.** Capital improvements within a type of public facility should be evaluated on the following criteria and considered in the order of priority listed below. Establish the final priority of all capital facility improvements using the following criteria as general guidelines. Any revenue source that cannot be used for a high priority facility

should be used beginning with the highest priority for which the revenue can legally be expended.

- I. Preservation - Reconstruction, rehabilitation, remodeling, renovation, or replacement of obsolete or worn-out facilities that contribute to achieving or maintaining standards for levels of service adopted in this Plan.
- II. Capacity - New or expanded facilities that reduce or eliminate deficiencies in levels of service for existing demand. Expenditures in this priority category include equipment, furnishings, and other improvements necessary for the completion of a public facility (e.g., recreational facilities and park sites).
- III. Safety - New public facilities, and improvements to existing public facilities that eliminate public hazards if hazards were not otherwise eliminated by facility improvements prioritized according to Policies a or b, above.
- IV. Support Development - New or expanded facilities that provide the adopted levels of service for new development and redevelopment during the next six fiscal years, as updated by the regular review of the CFP no less frequently than every 2 years. The County may acquire land or right-of-way in advance of the need to develop a facility for new development. The location of facilities constructed pursuant to this policy should conform to the Land Use Element and specific project locations must serve projected growth areas within the allowable land use categories. If the planned capacity of public facilities is insufficient to serve all applicants for development permits, the capital improvements are scheduled to serve the following priority order:
 - a. previously approved permits for redevelopment,
 - b. previously approved permits for new development,
 - c. new permits for redevelopment, and
 - d. new permits for new development.
- V. Cost Reduction - Improvements to existing facilities and new facilities that significantly reduce the operating cost of providing a service or facility or otherwise mitigate impacts of public facilities on future operating budgets.
- VI. Growth - New facilities that exceed the adopted levels of service for new growth during the next six fiscal years by either
 - e. providing excess public facility capacity needed by future growth beyond the next six fiscal years, or
 - f. providing higher quality public facilities than are contemplated in the County's normal design criteria for such facilities.
- VII. Legal Obligations - Facilities not described in Policies a through f, above, but which the County is obligated to complete, as evidenced by a written agreement the County executed prior to the adoption of this Plan.



All facilities scheduled for construction or improvement under this policy are evaluated to identify any plans of state or local governments or districts that affect the proposed County capital improvement.

Project evaluation may also involve additional criteria that are unique to each type of public facility as described in other sections of this element.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 5. Coordinated with Development

Coordinate capital facilities improvements with land development.

Capital Facilities and Utilities

Policy 5.1. Manage the land development process to ensure that new development meets the public facility levels of service standards, prioritizing improvements for historically underserved communities to meet adopted standards.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Capital Facilities and Utilities

Policy 5.2. In accordance with Kitsap County Health District and Washington State requirements, require connection to a public sewer system for new or extensively remodeled development located within 200 feet of a public sewer system.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 5.3. Ensure that development regulations require timely development of utility facility additions and improvements, and evaluate need to offsite improvements to be constructed by projects that exceed planned system capacities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 5.4. Utilize the most up-to-date utility information provided by service providers to assist in the analysis of the effects of climate change.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 5.5. Ensure the coordination of capital improvements and land development is conducted in a manner that is accessible to all communities, especially those that have been historically underserved and marginalized, and provides clear, transparent, and timely information for impacted parties.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 5.6. Consider the use of alternative sewage treatment techniques in areas that contain a significant concentration of critical areas, will be impacted by extreme rain and coastal flooding, or which have topographic challenges or critical aquifer recharge areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.a. Implement the schedule of capital improvements in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.b. Review stormwater regulations and design manuals as required by state law to ensure that Kitsap County is using the most up-to-date Best Management Practices in accordance with changes in state and federal stormwater regulations.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.c. Conduct an inventory of drainage basins through the Stormwater Division of Public Works to investigate existing and future stormwater drainage problems that may result from extreme precipitation or coastal flooding events.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.d. Use a health impact assessment or other equity tools to ensure communities that have been historically underserved and marginalized are included in the capital improvements planning process early and often.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.e. Regularly coordinate collection, integration, and maintenance of Geographic Information System (GIS) utility data among providers to ensure information on facility locations and capacities is consistent and up to date.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.f. On a yearly basis, propose any capital facilities or utilities Comprehensive Plan changes in the annual Docket and consider Plan amendments and related amendments to regulations consistent with RCW 36.70A.130.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 5.g. Evaluate requiring sewage treatment prior to drainfield treatment, either individually or for a community, in urban and rural areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 6. Utility Efficiency

Ensure utilities are provided in an efficient, coordinated, and timely manner to meet the needs of the County's current and future population.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 6.1. Designate utility corridors and facilities in a manner consistent with the needs and resources of Kitsap County.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 6.2. Encourage siting of large, above ground utilities (e.g., antennas, towers) in industrial or commercial areas or along appropriate transportation and utility corridors.



Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 6.3. Support the use of alternative sanitary sewer techniques within Urban Growth Areas, such as package plants, membrane, and drip systems, and/or community drain fields, in areas where public sewer systems may be more than 200 feet away.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 6.a. Evaluate requiring sewage treatment prior to drainfield, either individually or for a community, in urban and rural areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 6.b. Assess and plan for any impacts of climate change on sewer capacity, with coastal flooding and extreme rain events, through climate mitigation and adaptation measures.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 7. Service Quality

Maintain and enhance utility service and quality.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 7.1. Coordinate with utility providers to eliminate existing gaps or deficiencies in utility service and quality through enhancements, repairs, and replacements of obsolete or worn-out facilities to meet the needs of current and future development.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 7.2. In coordination between the County and utility providers, ensure that repairs and replacements of utilities are made to improve utility resilience to climate impacts, prioritizing improvements in areas that are disproportionately affected by climate change.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 7.3. Support utility programs and investments that reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase energy conservation, including the retrofit of existing buildings, expansion of alternative/clean energy within the public and private sector, and the use of environmentally sustainable building techniques and materials.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 7.a. Inventory existing deficiencies in service and quality in partnership with utility providers and the Kitsap County community.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 7.b. In coordination with utility providers, evaluate the fiscal cost of eliminating deficiencies in service, enhancing service quality, increasing resiliency, and reducing emission levels.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 7.c. Coordinate with community members and utility providers in developing an equity-driven approach to eliminate service deficiencies in Kitsap County.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 7.d. Utilize health impact or equity tools (e.g., those developed by PSRC, Kitsap County's Equity Atlas) parties when evaluating service deficiencies.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 7.e. When making improvements to increase resiliency of utilities, evaluate how changes to the following hazards could change the lifespan

and/or replacement cycle for facilities and equipment: sea level rise, flooding, wildfire, and urban heat island.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 8. Environmental Protection

Minimize environmental impacts of utility facilities and operations.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.1. Evaluate opportunities for groundwater quality and quantity enhancement that may be provided by sewer plants and septic systems.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.2. Continue to utilize emerging science and technologies to mitigate impacts from pollutants, increased rain events, and coastal flooding that may occur with these systems.”

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.3. Evaluate and mitigate the environmental health impacts in facilities development, including efficient use of energy, water, and materials, waste reduction, protection of environmental quality, and ecologically sensitive site selection and development.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.4. Evaluate, minimize, and mitigate unavoidable impacts to groundwater and surface water quality and quantity during the planning and development review process.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.5. Analyze the cumulative impacts of existing and future capital facilities and utilities development on groundwater and surface water quantity and quality.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.6. Ensure utility project designs address the extent of and mitigate for the recharge-limiting effect of impermeable surfaces and other factors affecting groundwater and surface water quantity and quality and consider increased flooding and rain events due to climate change.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.7. Support Kitsap Public Health District efforts to correct failing on-site sewage systems and address the impacts of heavier and more frequent rainfall events on on-site sewage systems and public health.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.8. Explore the use of green infrastructure wherever practical to reduce impacts on the environment, to manage wet weather and maintain and restore natural hydrology.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 8.9. Minimize the visual impact of utility facilities on view corridors, vistas, and adjacent properties by evaluating new or progressive design standards for cellular towers, antennas, power lines, and other types of utility facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 8.a. Utilize watershed and basin plans as a means of reducing stormwater impacts and nonpoint pollution.



Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 8.b. Explore long-term plans for stormwater controls at the watershed level and coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions. This should include consideration of facility capacity for increased extreme rain events and coastal flooding due to climate change.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 8.c. Expand the use of underground utilities and coordinate utility placement with road improvements.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 8.d. Participate in regional efforts to achieve Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for local water bodies as required by the Clean Water Act. Take steps to reduce nonpoint sources of pollution to Puget Sound and other water bodies.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 8.e. Consider and adapt to the impacts of climate change on TMDLs and nonpoint source pollution due to increased rain events, coastal flooding, as well as potential impacts to utility facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 9. Urban Facilities

Provide adequate public facilities to Urban Growth Areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 9.1. Require urban-level sanitary sewer or equivalent service in all Urban Growth Areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 9.2. Utilize existing capital facilities and utilities infrastructure more efficiently and cost effectively by incorporating energy conservation and alternative energy methods where feasible.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 9.3. Research and explore tools and methods for capital facilities and amenities to meet or exceed the baseline goals needed to address growth needs.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 9.4. Provide capital facilities that will serve the most pressing needs of the greatest number of Kitsap County community members through an equitable decision-making process that considers disparities across marginalized communities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 9.5. Plan for appropriate locations for future satellite offices for Kitsap County Sheriff's Office.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 9.6. Promote the siting of schools, institutions, and other community facilities that primarily serve urban populations within the urban growth area in locations where they will promote the local desired growth plans, except as provided for by RCW 36.70A.211.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 9.a. Update county-owned and operated sewer facility plans to include capacity demand and needs, and also major collection or conveyance systems for the 2044 planning horizon, while accounting for extreme precipitation and coastal flooding events.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 9.b. Prioritize Kitsap County expenditures for public services and facilities in Urban Growth Areas as an incentive to encourage development in urban areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 9.c. Negotiate with municipalities and other providers of public facilities to coordinate planning for and development of Urban Growth Areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 10. Rural Facilities

Provide adequate public facilities to rural areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 10.1. Ensure that public facilities provided in rural areas are compatible with rural character and are at a level, scale, and in locations that do not encourage urban expansion or development pressure.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 10.2. Coordinate with tribal governments, jurisdictions, and agencies to support the County as the preferred provider for rural services, agricultural services, services for natural resource areas, and regional services including hazard mitigation and emergency response planning.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 10.3. Promote affordable and equitable access to rural public services for all residents and employers in unincorporated rural Kitsap County, especially the historically underserved.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 10.a. Establish level of service standards in the rural area that are appropriate for rural land use and development patterns.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 10.b. Use data on underserved populations to help prioritize investments in rural infrastructure.

How has Kitsap County studied climate change resiliency?

Kitsap County completed a Climate Change Resiliency Assessment in 2020 as a step toward identifying and mitigating the impacts of climate change. See the assessment here: [Climate Change Resiliency Assessment \(2020\)](#)

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 11. Adaptation and Resilience

Support efforts to increase the resilience of public services, utilities, and infrastructure by preparing for disasters and other impacts and having a coordinated plan for system recovery.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 11.1. Plan for the adaptation and mitigation of the impacts of climate change, including sea-level rise, flooding, wildfire hazards, and urban heat on all new and existing development, infrastructure, and services.



Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 11.2. New electrical distribution lines should be installed underground where feasible to increase resilience. Encourage underground placement of existing distribution lines through such tools as local improvement districts.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 11.a. Develop a climate change, resiliency, and mitigation plan that assesses the vulnerabilities of vital county assets and that is coordinated with the cities, Tribes, federal, and regional jurisdictions.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 11.b. Coordinate the development of community public safety plans with appropriate jurisdictions, agencies, Tribes, service providers, and community organizations to address public health impacts, especially for most vulnerable populations, during system outages induced by climate impacts.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 12. Energy Sustainability and Resilience

Support plentiful, cost-effective environmentally friendly energy generation and promote energy conservation.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 12.1. Support renewable energy incentives to businesses and groups for a comprehensive renewable energy effort.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 12.2. Encourage alternative energy production as appropriate in urban and rural areas that are consistent with their respective zoning.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 12.3. Support green building and retrofit of existing public buildings and facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 12.4. Encourage electrification and decarbonization of the transportation system.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 12.5. Support necessary energy generation and redundant facilities to serve the Kitsap Peninsula.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 12.a. Integrate energy conservation and efficiency measures into County-sponsored capital improvement projects to reduce operating costs.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 13.b. Install electric vehicle charging stations at county-owned facilities and develop programs to incentivize their construction on private property.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 12.c. Encourage replacement of County fleet vehicles with electric vehicles at regularly scheduled replacement intervals as appropriate.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 12.d. Support development of alternative power generation, especially environmentally friendly methods, to supplement Kitsap County's power grid.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 13. Communication

Support efforts through private and public organizations to extend high-tech services including power and telecommunications.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 13.1. Support the extension of fiber optic cable in Kitsap County.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 13.2. Support the expansion of telecommunication infrastructure in accordance with FCC regulations and guidance to provide access to residents and businesses in all communities, especially underserved areas.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 13.a. Dedicate funding and resources to provide Wi-Fi and internet connection services within Kitsap County Parks for the public and in support of maintenance and operations.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 13.b. Coordinate with providers to ensure affordable and trustworthy broadband services are available to residents and businesses currently underserved.



Photo credit: Kitsap County



Capital Facilities and Utilities Goal 14. Community Enhancement

Integrate social, educational, and cultural components in public facilities whenever possible.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 14.1. Support and promote public art in all of Kitsap’s communities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 14.2. Support organizations and services that improve social, community, cultural, and health outcomes.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 14.3. Enhance awareness of social determinates of health.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Policy 14.4. Coordinate the design of public buildings and spaces in a manner that contributes to a sense of community.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 14.a. Review and revise the County’s Art and Culture Program as needed.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 14.b. Connect residents with organizations and services that fill gaps where the County is limited.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 14.c. Create opportunities for organizations to fill social, educational, health, and cultural gaps in public services and facilities.

Capital Facilities and Utilities Strategy 14.d. Feature the work of local artists, especially those from historically marginalized communities, in public art projects whenever possible.

REFERENCES

- [Capital Facilities Plan](#)



CHAPTER 8

Climate Change Element



Chapter 8 / **Climate Change Element**

VISION

County services, local economy, communities, and natural resources and systems are resilient to a changing climate and County greenhouse gas emissions are reduced consistent with regional goals.

INTENT

Climate change has already affected and will continue to affect the infrastructure, natural systems, economy, culture, safety, and livelihood of people who live, work, and play in Kitsap County. Kitsap County has experienced measurable and observable climate change trends and impacts including extreme heat, coastal flooding, and wildlife smoke. The intent of this element is to provide a consolidated policy framework related to climate issues that is essential to facilitating planning for our county and to assist in meeting the planning goals of the Growth Management Act.

GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT & REGIONAL COORDINATION

The Growth Management Act includes 15 goals to guide the development and adoption of comprehensive plans and regulations, with climate change and resiliency being the most recently added following the adoption of House Bill 1181. RCW 36.70A.020 was amended during the 2023 state legislative session to include the following goal for climate change and resiliency:

Ensure that comprehensive plans, development regulations, and regional policies, plans, and strategies ... adapt to and mitigate the effects of a changing climate; support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and per capita vehicle miles traveled; prepare for climate impact scenarios; foster resilience to climate impacts and natural hazards; protect and enhance environmental, economic, and human health and safety; and advance environmental justice.

Climate change is a key focus area for the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update. The County is taking a proactive approach to addressing climate change impacts. This element includes sub-elements focused on climate resilience and adaptation and greenhouse gas emissions reductions. Further, the element includes a variety of measures intended to advance environmental justice.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER ELEMENTS

Climate change related goals, policies, and strategies are found throughout the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. Goals and policies that are specifically related to Climate Change, rather than incidentally related, appear in this element.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

BACKGROUND

Kitsap County has recently completed assessments and studies to understand the impact of climate change on both built and natural systems. These assessments and studies help clarify the areas in which mitigation and resiliency planning is most needed. The findings of these assessments and studies, summarized below, in conjunction with other resources informed the development of this new Climate Change element.


Kitsap County Climate Change Resiliency Assessment, 2020

Kitsap County completed a Climate Change Resiliency Assessment in June 2020 in partnership with the cities of Bremerton and Port Orchard. The assessment is based on the best available science at the time and considers the probability of a wide range of impacts as they apply to Kitsap County including public health, infrastructure, agriculture, hydrology and hydrogeology, economy, land use and



development, cultural resources, habitat, local government finance, geologic and natural hazards, and wildfire. The assessment prioritizes risks to Kitsap County's residents, environment, economy, built environment, and infrastructure due to climate change. It provides a basis for future resiliency planning and information for Kitsap County agencies to prioritize specific threats. The analysis narrowed the range of possible impacts to a set of probable impacts and provides a high-level assessment and prioritization based on probability, timing, and magnitude.

Figure 28. GHG Emissions Sources, 2022



Kitsap County Community Wide Geographic Greenhouse Gas Emissions Inventory and Analysis, 2022

Kitsap County completed a greenhouse gas inventory that quantifies the annual emissions produced within the County's boundaries due to activities such as on-road transportation, tree loss, and energy consumption. The inventory and analysis provide a comprehensive update of Kitsap County's geographic greenhouse gas emissions for 2019. The report includes a progress update of historical trends and progress towards emission reduction goals, a contribution analysis to explore drivers of changes in emissions between 2015 and 2019, and a wedge analysis that shows estimated emissions reductions from existing policies and additional reduction needs to meet regionwide and countywide climate goals.

Based on 2019 data, Kitsap County's total greenhouse gas emissions were 3.2 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (MTCO₂e). As shown in Figure 28 on the previous page, five main sectors produced the greenhouse gas emissions. From 2015 to 2019, Kitsap County's overall emissions increased by approximately 16 percent.

Federal and state policies have already been passed to address some key emission sources. For example, the state Clean Energy Transformation Act sets milestones for all electric utilities serving retail customers to be carbon neutral by 2030 and to provide energy free of greenhouse gas emissions by 2045. The act requires utilities to eliminate coal-fired electricity from state portfolios.

Future forecasts indicate that the biggest emissions sources in 2050 will result from tree loss and agriculture, natural gas, mobile sources such as on-road vehicles, aviation, and off-road equipment, and solid waste disposal. Forecasts indicate that in 2050 there will still be an emissions gap of approximately 690,000 MTCO₂e that the County will need to close in order to meet the regional greenhouse gas emissions reduction goal.

KEY TERMS

Urban Forest - land in and around urban growth areas occupied or potentially occupied by trees and associated vegetation. Urban forest land may be planted or unplanted, used or unused, and includes public and private lands, lands along transportation and utility corridors, and forested watershed lands within populated areas.

Tree Cover - the biophysical presence of trees including natural forests or plantations existing over a range of densities. Data used for analysis defined tree cover as any vegetation taller than 16.4 feet.

Frontline community - a community that often face the first and worst impacts of climate change or will experience disproportionately higher climate-related health risks. These groups of people include children, elderly people, Tribal and Indigenous peoples, outdoor laborers, people experiencing homelessness, and people with chronic illnesses, among others.

Neighborhood Gathering Sites - a meeting point designated in a neighborhood to gather volunteers and to establish a point to drop-off resources after a disaster.



CLIMATE RESILIENCE AND ADAPTATION SUB-ELEMENT

Climate resilience is the ongoing process of anticipating, preparing for, and adapting to changes in climate and minimizing negative impacts to our natural systems, infrastructure, and communities. Climate resilience and adaptation goals and policies aim to improve the resiliency of Kitsap County's natural and built assets and communities to the negative impacts of climate change.

The goals and policies in this sub-element are organized by systems that are most vulnerable to and at risk of current and future climate change impacts based on the 2020 Kitsap County Climate Change Resiliency Assessment. Additionally, this sub-element includes Emergency Preparedness and Response goals and policies.

These systems include:

- **Emergency Preparedness and Response** – Community preparedness, response, and recovery adaptation is needed as the impacts of heat waves, drought, flooding, wildfires, and water shortages on individuals and households are likely to increase with the changing climate.
- **Public Health** – Harmful algal blooms, seawater intrusion due to sea level rise, nearshore flooding which impacts wells and onsite septic systems, respiratory illnesses from wildfire smoke, temperature related health issues from intense heat waves, zoonotic diseases and groundwater recharge changes which affect onsite septic systems and wells are the most likely impacts to public health due to climate change. Food insecurity and health issues could increase for people with natural resource-related occupations, such as fishing, forestry, agriculture, recreation, service industries, and construction. Frontline communities, or communities that often face the first and worst impacts of climate change, have and will continue to experience disproportionately higher climate-related health risks. These groups of people include the elderly, children, communities of color, people with chronic illnesses, Tribal and Indigenous peoples, and outdoor laborers, and people with low incomes.
- **Economy** – Values of property in low-lying or coastal areas may be adversely affected from future flooding and sea level rise. A wide variety of industries may be affected in the future, including construction and development, manufacturing, food and hospitality services, and natural resource economies. Displacement of workers due to flooding, extreme heat, fire, and other natural hazards exacerbated by climate change results in lost wages and productivity.
- **Cultural Resources** – Historical sites and buildings, parks, waterfronts, and archaeological sites are likely to be damaged from future flooding, extreme heat, and shifting precipitation patterns. Flooding, habitat shifts, and impacts to certain species such as salmon will have cultural and health impacts for Tribes.
- **Public Infrastructure** – Coastal flooding impacts from a combination of sea level rise, storm surges, and heavy precipitation events can result in substantial physical, ecological, and

infrastructure damage. This includes flooding of transportation routes, damage to waterfronts, inundation and saltwater intrusion of wastewater infrastructure, impacts to onsite sewage systems, impacts to drinking water wells, and overload of stormwater systems.

- **Land Use and Development** – Future urbanization and the increased use of impervious pavements are likely to increase the probability and severity of climate impacts such as urban flood events. Land use and vegetation cover may also shift with warmer temperatures and changing precipitation patterns, which may have secondary effects on natural flood control, urban heat island effect, and wildfire risk.
- **Hydrology and Hydrogeology** – Intense precipitation events, changes in seasonal precipitation patterns, higher water temperatures, changing streamflow patterns, less groundwater recharge, and declining water quality have implications for ecosystems, infrastructure, agriculture, and local communities.
- **Geologic and Natural Hazards** – Landslide risk will likely increase due to heavier rain events, soil erosion and destabilization, and sediment transport patterns. Bluff erosion rates may accelerate from winter storms, storm surges, sea level rise, and heavy rain events. Increased rates of bluff erosion will have long-term implications for properties, roads, and habitat on bluffs.
- **Habitat** – Future climate change will likely alter terrestrial, freshwater, marine, and coastal habitats. These habitat changes will have a wide range of impacts to sensitive species and ecological processes. The prevalence of invasive species and diseases is likely to increase.
- **Wildfire** – Wildfire risk is growing for Kitsap County under future climate conditions. New development within or adjacent to previously undeveloped (wildland) areas increases the risk of larger, more frequent, and destructive fires in susceptible areas and increases the likelihood that fires will spread uncontrolled across large areas and broad landscapes.



CLIMATE RESILIENCE AND ADAPTATION GOALS AND POLICIES

Climate Change Goal 1. Emergency preparedness and response

In collaboration with tribes and local emergency management programs, enhance emergency preparedness, prevention, response, and recovery efforts and mitigate the impacts associated with extreme weather and other hazards worsened by climate change.

Climate Change Policy 1.1. Collaborate with Kitsap County Department of Emergency Management to plan and implement the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan (2020) and Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment (2019).

Climate Change Policy 1.2. Support all hazard emergency preparedness, planning, and resiliency programs to reduce the impacts of climate change, such as heat waves, drought, flooding, wildfires, and water shortages on individuals and households.

Climate Change Policy 1.3. Ensure emergency evacuation procedures, including safe evacuation routes and arrival destinations exist, are in place, adequate to ensure life-safety, are known and accessible during flooding, wildfires, and other emergencies.

Climate Change Strategy 1.a. Develop policy recommendations to support mitigation efforts.

Climate Change Strategy 1.b. Support development of mitigation funds for homeowners to raise properties or relocate out of flood zones or areas frequently flooded due to sea level rise.

Climate Change Strategy 1.c. Support alternatives to and community education on the dangers of fireworks in collaboration with tribes and local emergency management programs and fire districts.

Climate Change Strategy 1.d. Facilitate development of objectives and strategies to improve resilience in vulnerable populations and frontline communities.

Climate Change Strategy 1.e. Facilitate development of disaster shelters that could be operated to provide life-safety respite during events where normal severe weather shelters cannot be opened.

Climate Change Strategy 1.f. Manage and remove debris during and after a disaster to reduce the risks of subsequent fire, flood, injury, contamination of waterways, blocking public safety access, and disease vectors.

Climate Change Strategy 1.g. Develop and expand hazard specific public information and outreach programs in coordination with county first responders, law enforcement, public and private agencies, local emergency management departments, Kitsap Public Health District, and Department of Community Development. Include the expansion of address searchable Geographic Information System (GIS) hazard maps and mitigation strategies for property owners.

Climate Change Strategy 1.h. Identify locations within the county using available technology to aid in finding people, such as unhoused encampments, and emergencies that do not have a physical address.

Climate Change Strategy 1.i. Develop a comprehensive countywide wildfire mitigation and protection strategy in collaboration with county residents, local fire marshals and code authorities, fire districts and departments, emergency management agencies, public and private utility providers, public schools, evacuation maps, and community warning systems.

Climate Change Strategy 1.j. Identify key evacuation sites to provide emergency sheltering during mandatory evacuations.

Climate Change Strategy 1.k. Develop eco-friendly paved bike routes to offer alternative transportation options and serve as emergency routes when primary roadways are blocked.

Climate Change Strategy 1.l. Identify locations that can serve as “resilience hubs,” community-serving facilities augmented to support multiple Neighborhood Gathering Sites for residents and coordinate resource distribution and services before, during, or after a natural hazard event.

Climate Change Strategy 1.m. Explore locations for permanent Neighborhood Emergency Supplies and Tools (NEST) kits for use by KCDEM volunteers and staff to use during declared emergencies.

Climate Change Goal 2. Public health

Protect community health and well-being from the impacts of climate-exacerbated hazards, prioritizing focus on overburdened communities, and ensuring that the most vulnerable residents do not bear disproportionate health impacts.

Climate Change Policy 2.1. Prioritize options for at-risk community members during wildfire smoke, extreme heat events, and flooding.

Climate Change Policy 2.2. Promote mitigation actions in flood-prone areas where wastewater systems and drinking water supplies may be compromised.

Climate Change Policy 2.3. Ensure public health and safety data related to climate change impacts are tracked, evaluated, and used for adaptive management of strategies and actions.

Climate Change Strategy 2.a. Support the Kitsap Public Health District in providing education and information to the community about the public health impacts of wildfire smoke and flooding.



Climate Change Strategy 2.b. Incentivize infrastructure updates (e.g., HVAC improvements) that protect against wildfire smoke for facilities that serve at-risk populations. Connect interested parties to grant resources as they become available for facilities to make improvements.

Climate Change Strategy 2.c. Support the Kitsap Public Health District in providing educational materials to the community on available air quality assistance and resources such as filter fans.

Climate Change Strategy 2.d. Amplify messaging from official agency watches and warnings to county residents about air quality and recommended actions to reduce exposure to wildfire smoke and particulate matter.

Climate Change Strategy 2.e. Incorporate wastewater and drinking water mitigation measures for new construction.

Climate Change Strategy 2.f. Support the Kitsap Public Health District in assessing onsite septic systems vulnerability to mitigate potential groundwater contamination.

Climate Change Strategy 2.g. Support the Kitsap Public Health District in assessing drinking water system vulnerability to sea level rise and provide information to the community about likely impacted areas to protect against salt water intrusion.

Climate Change Strategy 2.h. Work with Kitsap Public Health District and Kitsap County Department of Emergency Management to develop and implement a wildfire smoke resilience strategy in partnership with Kitsap County residents, tribes, state, county, and city emergency management partners, Puget Sound Clean Air Agency, and other partners.

Climate Change Strategy 2.i. Develop a program to provide emergency cooling and/or air-purifying resources to vulnerable populations.

Climate Change Strategy 2.j. Promote monitoring and mitigation actions for increased public health impacts due to climate change including those of the Kitsap Public Health District.

Climate Change Strategy 2.k. Support the Kitsap Public Health District's tracking of climate change related health indicators as part of their ongoing community health assessment.

Climate Change Strategy 2.l. Support the Kitsap Public Health District in providing educational materials and public health advisories to the community about harmful algae blooms (HABs) to minimize exposure.

Climate Change Strategy 2.m. Support the Kitsap Public Health District's efforts to provide educational materials and public health advisories to the community about increasing zoonotic diseases related to climate change.

Climate Change Goal 3. Economy

Shoreline properties, port districts, maritime industries, and businesses in general are resilient to impacts of climate change.

Climate Change Policy 3.1. Ensure development of Kitsap’s shoreline and waterfront economy is resilient to coastal flooding and sea level rise.

Climate Change Policy 3.2. Support workers displaced due to impacts of climate change.

Climate Change Policy 3.3. Support relocation or elevating of businesses in future inundation areas.

Climate Change Strategy 3.a. Assess the impacts of sea level rise on economic resources and develop strategies to mitigate the impacts.

Climate Change Strategy 3.b. Support development of programs that provide incentives or relief from impacts of climate change.

Climate Change Goal 4. Cultural resources

Cultural resources including historical sites and buildings, parks, waterfronts, and archaeological sites are protected from climate change impacts.

Climate Change Policy 4.1. Protect and preserve historical and archaeological sites from climate impacts.

Climate Change Strategy 4.a. Develop and implement a historic preservation plan that includes identification of climate impacts and mitigation planning for cultural resources such as historical sites and buildings, parks, waterfronts, and archaeological sites.

Climate Change Goal 5. Public infrastructure and transportation network

Public services, utilities, and infrastructure are resilient to impacts of climate change.

Climate Change Policy 5.1. Develop and adopt a coordinated plan for infrastructure system resilience and recovery after disasters.

Climate Change Policy 5.2. Develop and adopt a climate change mitigation plan that assesses the vulnerabilities of vital assets, in coordination with the cities, Tribes, federal, and regional jurisdictions.

Climate Change Policy 5.3. Consider stormwater utility improvements to accommodate increased conveyance during extreme rain events and coastal flooding.



Climate Change Policy 5.4. Explore adoption of a coordinated wastewater management plan to include Kitsap Public Health District, Public Utility Districts, Public Works, and other entities to enhance resiliency and adaptation planning for sewer utilities and wastewater management systems.

Climate Change Policy 5.5. Proactively manage the transportation system’s risk exposure to sea level rise, coastal flooding, extreme precipitation, and extreme heat.

Climate Change Strategy 5.a. Construct new wastewater management systems in areas resilient to climate change.

Climate Change Strategy 5.b. Coordinate with Public Works, utility providers, Kitsap Public Health District, and coastal communities to develop a sea level rise and coastal flooding vulnerability and risk assessment that identifies and maps areas of highest risk and outlines strategies to protect coastal infrastructure, communities, and natural assets.

Climate Change Strategy 5.c. Integrate climate resilient designs in transportation construction projects (e.g., climate smart culverts and bridges for fish passage and habitat quality).

Climate Change Goal 6. Resiliency through land use

Establish land use patterns that increase the resilience of the built environment, ecosystems, and communities to climate change.

Climate Change Policy 6.1. Restore and maintain critical areas and open space areas to maximize the climate resilience benefits they provide (e.g., frequently flooded areas, floodplains).

Climate Change Policy 6.2. Focus new development in areas where exposure to climate hazards is low.

Climate Change Policy 6.3. Consider environmental justice impacts to overburdened communities when considering new land use designations and rezoning actions.

Climate Change Strategy 6.a. Explore the use of environmental justice audits in creation of new zoning designations or rezoning.

Climate Change Strategy 6.b. Periodically update the Shoreline Master Program, Critical Areas Ordinance, and coastal resiliency plans to mitigate and adapt to climate change impacts.

Climate Change Strategy 6.c. Support and develop programs which incentivize voluntary restoration and preservation of critical areas, shorelines, and open space through financial or technical assistance.

Climate Change Goal 7. Protect and enhance forests

Maintain and expand tree canopy cover, improve watershed health, prioritize carbon sequestration, and build climate resilience.

Climate Change Policy 7.1. Ensure that construction within or abutting urban forests occurs in such a way as to protect the forest and the structures against the hazards of wildfire spreading from one to the other.

Climate Change Policy 7.2. Prioritize urban forestry planning resources for frontline communities that are impacted first and worst by climate change.

Climate Change Policy 7.3. Encourage private forestland to remain in timber production.

Climate Change Policy 7.4. Preserve tree canopy cover in critical areas such as streams, wetlands, geologic hazard areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, frequently flooded areas, and shorelines.

Climate Change Policy 7.5. Promote programs and grants to protect forested areas.

Climate Change Strategy 7.a. Reduce loss of private forestland through forest stewardship, education, and incentives for forest landowners to keep private forest lands in production.

Climate Change Strategy 7.b. Provide vegetation guidance to promote the planting of species that are resilient to climate change.

Climate Change Strategy 7.c. Coordinate with conservation groups and land trusts to identify and implement public outreach and education opportunities for the use of the Open Space Program, Transfer of Development Rights Program, Conservation Futures Tax Program, and other programs.

Climate Change Strategy 7.d. Promote urban forests through tree planting programs; maintenance of large healthy trees in parks, residential, commercial, and industrial areas; increased education and awareness, and through the protection and restoration of forest ecosystems.

Climate Change Strategy 7.e. Consider development of an urban forest master plan and applicable regulations.

Climate Change Strategy 7.f. Consider establishment of tree retention and replacement policies in all zones.



Climate Change Goal 8. Hydrology and hydrogeology

Protect and preserve water quality and quantity from drought, extreme heat, extreme precipitation, and other hazards exacerbated by climate change.

Climate Change Policy 8.1. Prioritize green infrastructure and low-impact development techniques, where appropriate, to address increased storm events, stormwater runoff, and local ocean acidification due to nutrient loading from runoff.

Climate Change Policy 8.2. Promote environmentally sustainable farming practices, water-storage systems, and nutrient management that help adapt to a changing climate and reduce production losses while balancing ecosystem needs.

Climate Change Policy 8.3. Coordinate with Kitsap Public Health District and water purveyors on well monitoring, specifically aquifer levels and saltwater intrusion.

Climate Change Policy 8.4. Coordinate with state and federal partners to evaluate long term cumulative impacts to watershed hydrology, including the provisions of sufficient streamflow for salmonids, and identify mitigation options.

Climate Change Strategy 8.a. Incentivize development that minimize the use of impervious pavements and retains tree canopy.

Climate Change Strategy 8.b. Provide guidance to promote the use of smart irrigation, stormwater nutrient management, preventative maintenance, water conservation and wastewater reuse, plant selection, and landscape management.

Climate Change Strategy 8.c. Identify and promote the development of water supplies in wildland and wildland urban interface or intermix areas to increase firefighting capabilities in rural and resource lands.

Climate Change Strategy 8.d. Coordinate with Kitsap Public Health District, Silverdale Water, and other interested purveyors on the use of recycled wastewater for uses such as building plumbing, irrigation, and groundwater recharge.

Climate Change Goal 9. Geologic and natural hazards

Built environment and new construction are resilient against landslides and other land instabilities.

Climate Change Policy 9.1. Develop regulations designed to avoid or restrict development, construction, or reconstruction in areas with known severe slide potential or other geologic hazards.

Climate Change Strategy 9.a. Ensure development regulations are based on best available science and take into consideration geologic and natural hazards exacerbated by climate change impacts.

Climate Change Goal 10. Habitat

Ensure the health, functions, and processes of natural environments and ecosystems, including forest lands, shorelines, freshwater systems, and critical areas are protected and adaptively managed for resiliency.

Climate Change Policy 10.1. Sustain functionality of ecosystem services and fish and wildlife habitat into the future.

Climate Change Policy 10.2. Utilize best available science to assist in identifying and protecting crucial wildlife corridor and riparian areas that may face impacts of climate change.

Climate Change Policy 10.3. Consider climate change impacts including sea level rise, extreme precipitation, increased streamflow, and other impacts in floodplain management planning.

Climate Change Policy 10.4. Support actions that increase the resilience of aquatic ecosystems.

Climate Change Policy 10.5. Protect and restore watershed-scale processes to maximize the ecological benefits and climate resilience of riparian ecosystems.

Climate Change Policy 10.6. Consider sea-level rise in coastal and nearshore habitat restoration projects.

Climate Change Policy 10.7. Protect and restore riparian vegetation to improve resilience of streams by reducing erosion, providing shade, regulating temperature, and enhancing other indicators.

Climate Change Policy 10.8. Protect and restore wetlands and headwaters to ensure biological and hydrological connectivity.

Climate Change Policy 10.9. Restore floodplains and their connectivity to improve the resilience of waterways and reduce flood risk.

Climate Change Strategy 10.a. To improve the climate resilience of streams and watersheds, implement actions identified in restoration and salmon recovery plans for watersheds in Kitsap County, including, but not limited to: Hood Canal Integrated Watershed Plan, West Sound Ecosystem Recovery Plan, East Kitsap Demographically Independent Population Steelhead Recovery Plan, Salmon Recovery and Conservation Plan East Kitsap Watershed Chapter, West Sound Nearshore Integration and Synthesis, Chico Creek Watershed Restoration Plan, Curley Creek Watershed Restoration Plan, and Blackjack Creek Watershed Restoration Plan.

Climate Change Strategy 10.b. Maintain and update a critical areas ordinance that incorporates climate change considerations.

Climate Change Strategy 10.c. Update the Shoreline Master Program to address potential changes to shorelines from sea level rise and coastal flooding.

Climate Change Strategy 10.d. Take early action to eliminate or control non-native invasive species, especially where they threaten native species or ecosystem function.



Climate Change Strategy 10.e. Implement the Kitsap Natural Resources Asset Management Program to assist in prioritizing projects that restore ecosystem health.

Climate Change Strategy 10.f. Maximize ecological benefits and climate resiliency of aquatic ecosystems through the implementation of salmon recovery and other ecosystem recovery plan recommendations, as appropriate.

Climate Change Strategy 10.g. Assess recommendations of approved Lead Entity salmon recovery plans and Ecosystem Recovery Plans to inform updates to County plans and development regulations.

Climate Change Strategy 10.h. Work with tribal, public, and private sector partners to restore the functions of streams and floodplains to improve the resilience of aquatic ecosystems and reduce flood risk.

Climate Change Goal 11. Wildfire resilience

Create resilience against wildfire across forest lands and Wildland Urban Interface / intermix areas.

Climate Change Policy 11.1. Promote and incentivize creation and implementation of Firewise strategies in coordination with county fire districts, the WA Department of Natural Resources, community groups, and landowners in forest and urban interface / intermix areas.

Climate Change Policy 11.2. Establish policies that manage growth within the Wildland Urban Interface.

Climate Change Strategy 11.a. Implement modern fire protection regulations and best management practices for all new development in urban interface / intermix areas and on private forest lands while safely maintaining tree canopy coverage where possible.

Climate Change Strategy 11.b. Provide incentives for current landowners to adopt and implement best management practices and modern fire regulations on existing land development and forest lands.

Climate Change Strategy 11.c. Provide educational material and resources for new and existing property owners to use in lowering their risk for wildland fires including fire resistive construction techniques, construction and maintenance of defensible spaces, and fire-resistant landscapes, fuel reduction, and land use practices.

Climate Change Strategy 11.d. Develop a mitigation fund for fire-wise neighborhood projects and re-roofing of homes with noncombustible materials.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTION SUB-ELEMENT

Greenhouse gas emissions reduction means taking action to reduce or eliminate greenhouse gas emissions, the quantity of which can help estimate the extent and severity of climate change impacts over time. This greenhouse gas reduction sub-element includes goals and policies that have a demonstrated ability to reduce local greenhouse gas emissions in support of statewide and regional climate goals.

A comprehensive update of Kitsap County's geographic greenhouse gas emissions was completed in 2022 as part of the Puget Sound Regional Emissions Analysis Project. It includes a progress update of historical trends, contribution analysis update to explore drivers of changes in emissions between 2015 and 2019, and a wedge analysis that shows estimated emissions reductions from existing policies. The goals and policies in this sub-element are organized by and build on the 2022 Kitsap County Greenhouse Gas Emissions Analysis.

- **Building energy** – residential, commercial, and industrial electricity and natural gas use and associated loss and leakage, residential fuel oil and propane, and industrial processes. Electricity and natural gas use in buildings account for most of the emissions in this sector.
- **Transportation** – driving within county limits, flights from county travelers, maritime and rail travel, equipment used for agriculture, recreation, construction, logging, and commercial activities. On-road passenger travel and freight movement account for most of the emissions in this sector.
- **Tree Loss** – agriculture and loss of tree cover. Loss of tree cover accounts for most of the emissions in this sector.
- **Solid Waste** – solid waste generation and disposal. Emissions from solid waste disposal transportation to a landfill out of state account for most of the emissions in this sector.



GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS REDUCTION GOALS AND POLICIES

Climate Change Goal 12. Emissions reduction

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions consistent with regional goal.

Climate Change Policy 12.1. Kitsap County adopts VISION 2050's climate change goal for the Puget Sound region to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80% below 1990 levels by 2050.

Climate Change Strategy 12.a. Work with incorporated cities, transit agencies, utility providers, tribes, and community partners to explore and implement strategies and actions to reduce community wide greenhouse gas emissions.

Climate Change Strategy 12.b. Promote strategies and actions that reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled within the County.

Climate Change Goal 13. Building decarbonization

Reduce greenhouse gases from buildings energy systems.

Climate Change Policy 13.1. Promote energy efficiency in county buildings.

Climate Change Policy 13.2. Recognize the importance of retrofitting existing buildings.

Climate Change Policy 13.3. Promote cost-effective renewable low-carbon energy generation.

Climate Change Policy 13.4. Promote energy conservation in new buildings.

Forests store carbon in tree trunks, roots, leaves, branches, and soil. When tree cover is lost, that carbon is released into the atmosphere.

Trees and forests in Kitsap County sequester around 942,000 MTCO₂e per year.

Tree cover loss is driven by deforestation due to development and other factors including timber harvest, fire, disease, and storm damage.

Tree cover loss emissions in 2019 increased by 51% compared to 2015.

Climate Change Strategy 13.a. Explore use of solar panels and other alternative energy on county buildings.

Climate Change Strategy 13.b. Promote energy efficiency assessments to prioritize investments in County facilities.

Climate Change Strategy 13.c. Explore funding and collaboration with community partners on incentives connecting homeowners and renters to energy efficiency opportunities (e.g., appliances, weatherization).

Climate Change Strategy 13.d. Develop a public building retrofit and replacement plan based on needs assessment and where the benefits are shared by low-income populations and BIPOC communities.

Climate Change Strategy 13.e.

Explore programs and incentives for businesses and organizations to implement small-scale renewable energy production and storage at their properties.

Climate Change Strategy 13.f.

Explore incentives for sustainable and green development (e.g., LEED certified) and low impact development.

Climate Change Strategy 13.g.

Adopt a Commercial Property Assessed Clean Energy and Resiliency (C-PACER) Program to ensure a lower-cost financing option is accessible and affordable to building owners to use for higher-efficiency electrified systems and resiliency improvements.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Climate Change Goal 14. Tree loss prevention

Minimize tree loss due to development and preserve existing tree canopy cover.

Climate Change Policy 14.1. Focus growth within existing Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) using infill and redevelopment techniques.

Climate Change Policy 14.2. Reduce tree loss by using infill, redevelopment techniques, and lot clustering in rural zones.

Climate Change Strategy 14.a. Coordinate with federal and state agencies to create and support forest management plans to minimize tree loss on military bases in Kitsap County.

Climate Change Strategy 14.b. Coordinate with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Tribal governments, community groups, and private forest landowners to promote long-term preservation of forest lands.

Climate Change Strategy 14.c. Develop and implement tree canopy regulations, standards, and incentives to protect existing tree canopy cover and replace removed trees in areas slated for development, while addressing best management practices for wildfire prevention.

Climate Change Strategy 14.d. Consider conservation or in-lieu fee programs to allow for off-site tree planting when not feasible on a development site.



Climate Change Goal 15. Park tree canopy

Manage tree canopy within park areas to sequester carbon.

Climate Change Policy 15.1. Support implementation of forest management plans to maintain healthy forests on Parks-owned properties while allowing opportunities for recreation.

Climate Change Strategy 15.a. Identify and assess parks resource areas for their suitability for recreational uses and opportunities for habitat restoration or preservation utilizing tools including but not limited to the Kitsap Natural Resource Asset Management Program.

Climate Change Goal 16. Transportation decarbonization

Reduce greenhouse gas emissions from on-road passenger and freight vehicle.

Climate Change Policy 16.1. Encourage mixed use, high density, Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to reduce reliance on Single Occupancy Vehicles (SOVs) and reduce per capita Vehicle Miles Traveled.

Climate Change Policy 16.2. Support compact commercial areas in order to encourage pedestrian and non-motorized travel and transit use.

Climate Change Policy 16.3. Support Electric Vehicle charging expansion throughout the county in collaboration with local utilities.

Climate Change Policy 16.4. Work in collaboration with local utilities, freight companies, and service agencies toward fleet electrification of freight and service vehicles.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

Climate Change Strategy 16.a. Work with Kitsap Transit to plan and implement Express and Bus Rapid Transit services to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions within the Urban Growth Areas and between communities and centers.

Climate Change Strategy 16.b. Develop and implement an Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Plan.

Climate Change Strategy 16.c. Develop a plan to electrify freight and publicly owned service vehicles, which should include analysis and recommendations on 2030 and 2050 fleet electrification goals and on the facilities and infrastructure required to meet those goals and complement the Electric Vehicle Infrastructure plan.

Climate Change Goal 17. County equipment decarbonization

Decarbonize County-owned off-road and construction equipment.

Climate Change Policy 17.1. Partner with public and private entities to utilize more sustainable fuels in offroad equipment.

Climate Change Strategy 17.a. Establish goal dates to phase out gas-powered maintenance equipment and transition to using electric equipment (lawnmowers, leaf blowers, etc.) for County maintenance and operations and allocate funding for additional batteries to avoid down time due to charging needs.

Climate Change Goal 18. Solid waste and wastewater emissions reduction

Reduce emissions resulting from the generation, transportation, and disposal of solid waste.

Climate Change Policy 18.1. Encourage reduction as a first step in reducing waste and associated emissions.

Climate Change Policy 18.2. Ensure that community facilities for reuse and recycling, including composting, are easily accessible.

Climate Change Policy 18.3. Consider methods to manage solid waste locally, thereby reducing emissions associated with transportation to out-of-state landfill facilities.

Climate Change Policy 18.4. Reduce carbon footprint of wastewater treatment facilities.

Climate Change Policy 18.5. Explore collaborative partnerships to reduce energy demand at existing facilities and offset emissions.

Climate Change Strategy 18.a. Engage in environmentally preferable purchasing practices and support use of products with minimal impacts on the environment, health, and safety.

Climate Change Strategy 18.b. Encourage local development of recovery facilities for recyclable materials.

Climate Change Strategy 18.c. Evaluate scenarios of operating a local landfill with methane capture, waste to energy plant, or other methods of keeping solid waste disposal local.

Climate Change Strategy 18.d. Evaluate expansion of yard waste collection services to minimize emissions from burning of yard waste debris.



Photo credit: Kitsap County

RESOURCES

- Kitsap County Climate Change Resiliency Assessment, 2020
- Kitsap County Communitywide Geographic Greenhouse Gas Emissions, 2022
- Kitsap County Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan, 2020
- Hazard Identification and Vulnerability Assessment, 2019



PORT ORCHARD, WA

CHAPTER 9

Subarea and Neighborhood Plans

Subarea and Neighborhood Plans

A subarea plan is a type of long-range planning for a limited geographic area within a community. Within Kitsap County, the following subarea plans and neighborhood plans have been adopted:

- Kingston Subarea Plan
- Manchester Subarea Plan
- Silverdale Regional Center Subarea Plan
- Silverdale Subarea Plan
- Suquamish Subarea Plan
- Keyport Neighborhood Plan
- Gorst Neighborhood Plan
- Illahee Neighborhood Plan

These subarea plans focus on goals and policies to form the framework for the plan as well as specific goals and policies for land-use, environmental protection, and transportation.



KINGSTON, WA

By Erik Hanson

CHAPTER 10

Kingston Subarea Plan



Kingston Subarea Plan

VISION FOR KINGSTON

Kingston is a small ferry community, located on Appletree Cove, known for its sweeping views of Puget Sound and both the Cascade and Olympic Mountain ranges. It is bordered by rural residential properties on three sides and Puget Sound to the east. The community offers small-town character as well as a recently built multi-generational community center, small locally owned businesses, and several parks and trails within walking distance from the Old Town Center. The waterfront encompasses a port with a large marina, public beach access and a terminal for the Washington State Ferry Kingston-Edmonds route and a Kitsap Transit fast foot ferry that connects Kingston to Seattle, making it a key transportation hub between the Olympic and Kitsap Peninsulas and the Seattle metropolitan area. The community also serves as a commercial and service destination for North Kitsap.

The Kingston Urban Growth Area (UGA), the northernmost UGA in Kitsap County, was established in May 1998 through adoption of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan, encompassing approximately 1,400 acres. The Kingston UGA includes three design districts - Old Town, adjacent to the marina and ferry terminal; and two that are uptown. Lindvog Commercial, which straddles State Route 104, and Village Green, which sits entirely on the south side of State Route 104 and reflects the neighborhood in and around the Village Green Community Center and park.

A portion of Kingston is designated as a High-Capacity Countywide Center in the Kitsap Countywide Planning Polices (CPPs). This Countywide Center and the remainder of the Kingston UGA must accommodate increased population, employment, and housing growth consistent with those designations.

Kingston promotes expanded development opportunities in its downtown as infill development occurs and major projects including the SR104 realignment and Port of Kingston redevelopment occur. Improved street aesthetics and parking infrastructure will create a more walkable community and encourage accessibility to local shops and restaurants. Expanded infrastructure such as sidewalks, bike lanes connecting activity centers such as the community center, local schools, and retail and service businesses will increase health, safety, and connectedness within the community.

With multiple high-capacity transit opportunities to the greater Seattle Area, Kingston is a part of critical transit system for the community, commuters, and tourists. Service by multiple ferry systems must be maintained and expanded to meet expected growth. Kingston must balance this growth with its history as a welcoming and family friendly community that values a healthy and sustainable environment, quality education, and recreational resources for all ages. By prioritizing preservation and development of diverse housing types, Kingston intends to maintain and increase its posture as an affordable and inclusive community.

The vision for Kingston focuses on the continued preservation and protection of open space, forests, and critical habitat areas in the surrounding sensitive environment. As an Urban Growth Area, Kingston will expand on the success of the Village Green Project and continue to develop better public facilities and infrastructure as it grows. County support of local economic development and Kitsap Transit and State support in managing the impact of regional transportation are vital to Kingston’s vision and vitality.



Figure 29. Kingston UGA Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative





Figure 30. Kingston Countywide Center Zoning Map – Board of County Commissioners Direction Preferred Alternative



Kingston Goals, Policies, and Strategies

COMMUNITY

Kingston Goal 1.

Identify, protect, and promote community identity and history.

Kingston Policy 1.1. Preserve Kingston’s small-town waterfront and maritime character and local history through community planning and development.

Kingston Policy 1.2. Promote community organizations and events that maintain, enhance, and promote community character.

Kingston Policy 1.3. Preserve the community’s historic cultural assets in public planning and development projects.

Kingston Policy 1.4. Support the Kingston community’s discussions of incorporation with access to readily available data regarding revenues and costs of service to the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 1.a. Notify the Kingston Historical Society in addition to mandated agencies when artifacts or evidence of historic structures or activities are unearthed or otherwise discovered.

Kingston Strategy 1.b. Provide available materials to promote a community inventory of cultural resources: places and events significant to Kingston’s history and people, including natural landmarks, settler contact with the Suquamish and S’Klallam Tribes, military and maritime history, timber and commercial enterprises, homesteads and early town life, community organizations, milestones and special occasions, and national contributions of local figures.

Kingston Strategy 1.c. Encourage self-guided tours that highlight Kingston’s community inventory of cultural resources.

Kingston Strategy 1.d. Develop interpretive signage recognizing sites in the community inventory.

Kingston Strategy 1.e. Promote educational seminars that feature the community inventory.

Kingston Strategy 1.f. Engage in a campaign that educates the general public about identifying and understanding the significance of cultural resources and how protecting historic assets may be integrated into urban development or other land uses.

Kingston Strategy 1.g. Explore funding for the preservation of historic, archaeological, and cultural resources.

LAND USE

Kingston Goal 2.

Involve the Kingston community in review and revision of goals, policies, and development regulations.

Kingston Policy 2.1. Provide support to the Kingston Community Advisory Council (KCAC) to review the sub area plan to ensure code provisions and design standards are achieving the vision for downtown Kingston, incorporating public feedback, and supporting redevelopment.

Kingston Policy 2.2. Acknowledge past community planning efforts in updates to policies and codes (e.g., Kingston UVC Taskforce).

Kingston Strategy 2.a. Every three years, establish a community workgroup process to review the Kingston Design standards and code provisions to ensure they are in alignment with the comprehensive plan update goals and policies.

Kingston Goal 3.

Encourage development that is compatible with Kingston's character and maritime history.

Kingston Policy 3.1. Consider the impact on view corridors when approving new developments.

Kingston Strategy 3.a. Apply the Kingston Design Standards in the permitting process.

Kingston Goal 4.

Support redevelopment in the Kingston Countywide Center.

Kingston Policy 4.1. Encourage a mix of urban residential, mixed-use, and commercial development in the downtown core as defined by the boundaries of the Kingston Countywide Center.

Kingston Policy 4.2. Prioritize the required infrastructure to encourage urban medium and high-density residential uses near commercial areas and public spaces.

Kingston Strategy 4.a. Revise densities, heights, setbacks, infrastructure, parking, and other requirements in the Kingston Countywide Center to eliminate barriers for developing small parcels and explore incentives to promote aggregation of small lots into larger parcels.

Kingston Strategy 4.b. Revise the subdivision regulations to remove barriers to the creation of short subdivisions and multi-family development in the Kingston Countywide Center.

Kingston Strategy 4.c. Assess opportunities for development to meet recreational and open space requirements off-site where there are existing services and amenities are within one-quarter mile.



Kingston Strategy 4.d. Assess roadways in the Kingston Countywide Center to identify where right of way could be reduced to incentivize redevelopment.

Kingston Strategy 4.e. Review fire department requirements for small developments in the Kingston Countywide Center for alternatives that preserve safety and consider existing fire infrastructure and historic street patterns.

Kingston Strategy 4.f. Explore grant and other funding opportunities to address infrastructure needs.

Kingston Goal 5.

Promote adequate parking to meet Kingston's needs while encouraging transit and non-motorized options.

Kingston Policy 5.1. Collaborate with community groups and the Port of Kingston to develop a parking plan for the Kingston Countywide Center.

Kingston Strategy 5.a. Explore the reduction of parking requirements to promote transit route expansion.

Kingston Strategy 5.b. Complete a public parking availability and accessibility study, considering updates or changes to parking requirements relating to occupancy in the Kingston Countywide Center.

Kingston Strategy 5.c. Coordinate public and private partnerships in review of the existing public parking availability and future expansions.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Kingston Goal 6.

Support Kingston's maritime economy

Kingston Policy 6.1. Support Port initiatives designed to prioritize maritime and water dependent uses (e.g., boat/kayak rentals).

Kingston Policy 6.2. Explore partnerships with the Port of Kingston to seek grants for maritime uses, mixed use development, and environmental protections.

Kingston Policy 6.3. Support the development of lodging opportunities in Kingston by reviewing zoning and regulatory requirements to remove any barriers.

Kingston Strategy 6.a. Implement way-finding signage consistent with the community's identity to highlight local businesses, history, attractions, and trails, especially during the development of infrastructure projects.

Kingston Strategy 6.b. Support tourism groups, the Port of Kingston, the Kingston Chamber of Commerce, and the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance to assess tourism opportunities and develop strategies to promote tourism.

Kingston Goal 7.

Within the Kingston Urban Growth Area, support locally owned businesses, cottage industries, and home businesses.

Kingston Policy 7.1. Encourage the development of telecommunication and broadband infrastructure to serve the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 7.2. Collaborate with local organizations and agencies including the Chamber of Commerce, Kitsap Public Utilities District, and Port of Kingston to foster and promote an information system infrastructure and promote a business atmosphere that encourages and supports technology-based industry.

Kingston Policy 7.3. Encourage small business development and business incubators.

Kingston Goal 8.

Support tourism to enhance the local economy.

Kingston Policy 8.1. Foster partnerships with the North Kitsap Tourism Coalition, Visit Kitsap, the Port of Kingston, the Kingston Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Kingston Economic Development Committee, and other organizations to promote tourism and business development.

HOUSING

Kingston Goal 9.

Promote the development of affordable housing within the Kingston UGA

Kingston Policy 9.1. Monitor Kitsap County-owned property in the Kingston UGA and assess their availability for affordable housing projects.

Kingston Policy 9.2. Review and revise as appropriate regulations to improve the viability and long-term sustainability of affordable housing projects.

Kingston Policy 9.3. Incentivize affordable housing projects through negotiation of development agreements, creation of multi-family taxation exemptions, and other allowable methods (see Appendix B).



Kingston Policy 9.4. Support Housing Kitsap, housing agencies, and non-profit housing providers in considering affordable housing projects within the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 9.5. Encourage private property owners with vacant property or property available for redevelopment within Kingston’s UGA to consider affordable housing projects.

Kingston Policy 9.6. Promote housing diversity including missing-middle housing (e.g., duplex townhomes, cottage housing) within existing and planned residential developments.

Kingston Goal 10.

Consider affordable housing projects within the Kingston UGA for any County-administered funding programs.

Kingston Policy 10.1. Partner with non-governmental groups and non-profits (e.g., Kitsap Affordable Housing Task Force and Kingston Affordable Housing Working Group) to ensure knowledge and participation in local funding opportunities.

Kingston Goal 11.

Encourage increased support services in the Kingston UGA to serve residents in need of affordable housing.

Kingston Policy 11.1. Work with County agencies and non-government service providers to increase the local availability of services for mental health support, social work case management, private duty caregiver assistance, alcohol and chemical dependency treatment, disability assistance, and healthcare.

Kingston Policy 11.2. Encourage transit agencies such as Kitsap Transit and Washington State Ferries to provide reliable and expanded transportation options for residents in the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Goal 12.

Monitor housing types including emergency housing and provide policy direction to facilitate adequate housing for all economic segments living in the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 12.1. Seek to ensure that unhoused options in the Kingston UGA include long term supportive housing for those who are unhoused and others with special needs, affordable housing for low-income seniors and others, “missing middle” housing, workforce housing, and market rate housing.

Kingston Policy 12.2. Work with Kingston Community Advisory Council to support ongoing efforts to provide severe weather shelter services and/or warming stations in public buildings.

Kingston Strategy 12.a. Explore increased density and building heights, reduced parking requirements, lower impact fees and permitting fees, and expedited permit processing for affordable housing projects.

Kingston Strategy 12.b. Adopt ordinances, development regulations, and zoning regulations to reduce barriers to the construction and use of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) for long term rental housing in the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 12.c. Support community and housing organization efforts to fund affordable and supportive housing efforts in the Kingston UGA.

ENVIRONMENT AND SUSTAINABILITY

Kingston Goal 13.

Protect and work to restore wildlife habitat, marine shorelines, wetlands, streams, and other natural areas in the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 13.1. Support community work with non-profit groups to acquire land for conservation and preservation of wildlife habitat.

Kingston Policy 13.2. Participate in the West Sound Watersheds Council and support Puget Sound Salmon Recovery programs.

Kingston Policy 13.3. As feasible, acquire shoreline property and conservation easements in Kingston for public stewardship and habitat protection.

Kingston Policy 13.4. Coordinate an integrated network of open spaces that could expand recreational opportunities for both residents and visitors and that takes advantage of Kingston's visual amenities and natural environment.

Kingston Goal 14.

Reduce sources of pollution in the built and natural environment of Kingston.

Kingston Policy 14.1. Partner with Puget Sound Clean Air Agency to identify and establish strategic initiatives and projects that will protect public health, improve neighborhood air quality, and reduce our region's contribution to climate change.

Kingston Policy 14.2. Establish a community culture that supports pedestrians and non-motorized forms of transportation.

Kingston Policy 14.3. Identify and reduce systemic energy waste and its associated GHGs.

Kingston Policy 14.4. Reduce water and soil pollution from land uses and development.



Kingston Policy 14.5. Educate and build a culture in the greater Kingston community about the marine environment and the unique nexus of estuarine and lowland stream environments to inspire future stewards of our natural heritage.

Kingston Strategy 14.a. Review and consider tree canopy requirements to promote GHG emission absorption.

Kingston Strategy 14.b. Support ferry traffic solutions, in alignment with the WSF 2040 Long Range Plan, that leverage both system-wide and Kingston-Edmonds route-specific adaptive management strategies to reduce peak demand in closer alignment with supply.

Kingston Strategy 14.c. Support measures such as peak fares in the ferry system to reduce vehicle idling and queuing which results in increased vehicle emissions.

Kingston Strategy 14.d. Encourage expansion of sewer service to properties served by existing septic systems within the Kingston UGA through ULIDs, Developer Extensions, and other development options.

Kingston Goal 15.

Encourage businesses that intentionally work to build and support a healthy natural environment.

Kingston Policy 15.1. Support locally based businesses that intentionally address environmental sustainability (e.g., green building practices, recycling of construction or demolition waste, non-motorized services).

PARKS, TRAILS, AND OPEN SPACE

Kingston Goal 16.

Support access to and within regional parks, local pocket parks, and public beaches for active recreational use, passive enjoyment of the natural environment, and conservation of natural habitat.

Kingston Policy 16.1. Prepare a Kingston conservation plan and list of potential properties for conservation, preservation, and wildlife enhancement in coordination with Great Peninsula Conservancy, West Sound Watersheds Council, and Puget Sound Salmon Recovery programs.

Kingston Policy 16.2. Acquire shoreline property for public access to Apple Tree Cove, Port Gamble, Miller Bay, Puget Sound, and local lakes, including Carpenter Lake and Miller Lake.

Kingston Strategy 16.a. Seek funding to acquire and protect marine and riparian shoreline for conservation and habitat preservation.

Kingston Strategy 16.b. Survey and analyze public lands for potential value as park land, trails, or open space.

Kingston Strategy 16.c. Clarify public access opportunities along beaches and tidelands around Apple Tree Cove and publish maps and other information to the public.

Kingston Strategy 16.d. Support the Kitsap Peninsula Water Trail by developing water trail launch and rest facilities in the Kingston area.

Kingston Goal 17.

Provide Kingston with the open space, sports, and playground facilities to support recreation, sports, healthy exercise, and social activities for all members of the greater Kingston population.

Kingston Policy 17.1. In accordance with the Kitsap Parks and Recreation Department PROS Plan, develop and maintain an inventory of Kingston and North Kitsap parks, open space, and sports facilities available for use by the general population and organized sports clubs.

Kingston Policy 17.2. Based on public surveys, growth projections, and other data, prepare and publish a gap analysis to show the current and future need for public sports and recreational facilities.

Kingston Policy 17.3. Develop dog parks within or near the Kingston UGA and establish a program for their maintenance and support.

Kingston Strategy 17.a. Acquire land and develop sports fields, courts, and playground facilities as the population growth warrants to serve the greater Kingston area to support local, regional, and invitational sports events to include:

- Baseball and softball fields
- Fields for soccer, lacrosse, and ultimate frisbee
- Football fields
- Outdoor basketball courts
- Pickleball and tennis courts
- Frisbee golf course

Kingston Strategy 17.b. Develop criteria for location and design of local dog parks.

Kingston Strategy 17.c. Identify and evaluate areas for dog parks and seek funding for acquisition and maintenance.

Kingston Strategy 17.d. Establish a plan, budget, and volunteer group for the upkeep of the dog park facility in coordination with the local parks district.

Kingston Strategy 17.e. Improve and expand parking and signage for the “Kingston entrance” to the North Kitsap Heritage Park located at the south end of Norman Road.



Kingston Goal 18.

Ensure public participation in development of plans for maintenance and operation of parks, open space, fields, and facilities in the Kingston area including volunteer efforts.

Kingston Policy 18.1. Coordinate discussions of new, renovated, or existing parks and open space plans and facilities with community groups (e.g., Kingston Community Advisory Council, Rotary, Village Green Metropolitan Park District, Chamber, Port of Kingston) and residents.

Kingston Policy 18.2. Consult with state agencies, local Tribes, and local jurisdictions to provide parks, open space, fields, and facilities that support active and passive recreation.

Kingston Goal 19.

Support the Village Green Community Center as a central aspect of the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 19.1. Consider the Village Green property and facilities when locating new community activities and assets in Kingston.

Kingston Policy 19.2. Leverage the Village Green Community Center to provide increased access to County services by north county residents and businesses. Ideas include office hours by the County Commissioner and key department teams (DCD), pop-ups to offer services or explain new projects.

TRANSPORTATION**Kingston Goal 20.**

Support the development of housing diversity, multi-family, and mixed-use housing in the Kingston Countywide Center through expanded transportation options.

Kingston Policy 20.1. Promote expansion of access and accessibility of transit and transit facilities within the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 20.a. Coordinate with Kitsap Transit and Washington State Ferries to provide access and service frequencies necessary to support planned population and employment growth and densities.

Kingston Goal 21.

Improve compatibility between ferry traffic and residential and commercial uses in the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 21.1. Work with WSDOT to expedite the installation of ferry traffic flow improvement methods to improve traffic flow within the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 21.a. Support development of the Active Traffic Management System (ATMS) project.

Kingston Strategy 21.b. Until installation of the ATMS system, encourage WSDOT to train staff on traffic management methods that expand access to Kingston businesses and amenities for passengers during ferry wait times.

Kingston Strategy 21.c. Promote the development of a remote ferry vehicle holding lot.

Kingston Strategy 21.d. Support the SR104 realignment project.

Kingston Strategy 21.e. Encourage WSDOT exploration of demand management strategies to reduce peak volumes. Examples include peak fares.

Kingston Strategy 21.f. Review traffic stoplight timing patterns that would prioritize ferry traffic flow within the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 21.g. Encourage improvements to the Kitsap Transit Ferry dock to allow severe weather use.

Kingston Goal 22.

Provide safe, accessible walk, bike, and roll routes within Kingston and to other communities.

Kingston Policy 22.1. Plan and construct walk, bike, and roll facilities described in the Kingston Complete Streets Study, connecting to those in the greater Kingston area.

Kingston Policy 22.2. Expand ADA compliant sidewalks, connector trails, and walk, bike, and roll routes in greater Kingston.

Kingston Policy 22.3. Ensure new development constructs walk, bike, and roll facilities and community connections in accordance with Kitsap County Code and the Kingston Complete Streets Plan.

Kingston Policy 22.4. Provide bicycle parking at transit and ferry facilities, community centers, and commercial uses within the Kingston Countywide Center.

Kingston Strategy 22.a. Explore traffic calming techniques, where safe and feasible within the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 22.b. Develop and publish an accessibility rating and description for each walk, ride and roll facilities and parks within Kingston to increase community awareness and



user understanding of which sidewalks and trails are accessible to those with mobility limitations.

Kingston Strategy 22.c. Expand sidewalks with development proposals along arterials and collectors, and routes connecting pedestrians and bicyclists within the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Strategy 22.d. Review traffic flow and safety issues for pedestrian and vehicle traffic at SR104 and Barber Cut-off/Parcells Rd in collaboration with WSDOT.

Kingston Strategy 22.e. Expand sidewalks in commercial and residential areas to complete continuous connections between activity centers consistent with Kingston Complete Streets and Kingston Design Standards. These should include:

- Along SR104 from ferry terminal to Lindvog Avenue.
- Along West Kingston Road from Carpenter Creek Bridge to Kingston Middle School.
- Along Ohio Ave NE from SR 104 to Kingston Laborer’s Training School.
- Along Lindvog Ave NE from SR 104 to NE 272nd Street.

Kingston Strategy 22.f. Explore increased scoring for non-motorized facilities in local funding programs such as the Transportation Improvement Program.

Kingston Strategy 22.g. Review all utility easements, tax title strips, and unopened right of ways for potential trail connections. For those utility easements considered as feasible for trail routes, negotiate an appropriate agreement for use as a non-motorized trail and/or route.

Kingston Strategy 22.h. Install fog lines along all public roads within the Kingston UGA to improve the safety of non-motorized users.

Kingston Goal 23.

In support of the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facilities Plan, provide safe, direct routes to multi-user, regional trails within the county and to regional trails in adjacent counties.

Kingston Policy 23.1. On a regular basis, review the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facilities Plan for new opportunities and status of existing regional routes and trails.

Kingston Strategy 23.a. Prepare a Kingston Trails Plan that identifies the existing system of community connector and recreational trails and routes. Identify and prioritize the community’s desired projects and additions to extend the range and accessibility of that system of trails and routes.

Kingston Strategy 23.b. Install signs that identify access points and destinations of the various connector trails and routes.

Kingston Strategy 23.c. Coordinate local trails and routes to the Kitsap County Non-Motorized Facility Plan.

Kingston Strategy 23.d. Submit possible connecting trails and routes to the County via the annual TIP process.

Kingston Strategy 23.e. Ensure public notification to include Kingston community groups before approval of requests vacation of rights-of-way.

Kingston Goal 24.

Improve the safety and appearance of walk, bike, and roll facilities within Kingston UGA as recommended in the Complete Streets Study.

Kingston Policy 24.1. Provide clear walk, ride, and roll road crossings of SR 104, West Kingston Road NE, Barber Cut Off Road NE, and Miller Bay Road for pedestrian routes to activity centers including schools and parks.

Kingston Policy 24.2. Encourage connectivity between existing developments, by providing alternate emergency access/egress routes for residential development currently served by a single access roadway.

Kingston Strategy 24.a. Within the Kingston Countywide Center, explore Street Lights on all streets within the UGA.

Kingston Strategy 24.b. Require planting strips between the roadway and sidewalks and bicycle paths with new development, where feasible.

Kingston Strategy 24.c. Review the Kingston Design Standards to ensure consistency with state and local road standards.

CAPITAL FACILITIES AND UTILITIES

Kingston Goal 25.

Provide adequate infrastructure capacity to support development of housing diversity, multi-family, and mixed-use housing in the Kingston UGA.

Kingston Policy 25.1. Provide adequate wastewater infrastructure including new and upgraded pump stations to accommodate growth, with opportunities for private development to construct new and improve existing pump stations.

Kingston Policy 25.2. Provide adequate stormwater infrastructure focused on regional systems.

Kingston Strategy 25.a. Develop new and expanded pump stations (e.g., 41 and 71) and force and gravity sewers to expand capacity for new growth.



Kingston Strategy 25.b. Develop new stormwater facility to facilitate development in the Kingston Countywide Center (e.g., Kingston Regional Stormwater Facility, Bannister Green Street Project, Eastside Green Street Project and Main Street WQ Treatment Project).



DOWNTOWN MANCHESTER, WA

CHAPTER 11

Manchester Subarea Plan



Manchester Subarea Plan

VISION FOR MANCHESTER

The Manchester Community Plan is a statement of the community values and aspirations for the future. This is an effort to recognize what originally attracted visitors in the past combined with a phasing process of improvements to enhance the atmosphere and visual character of the area. When posed with the question, "What would the perfect Manchester look like?" residents envisioned a village center that acts as a social center with restaurants and cafes, augmented by a food or general store to provide basic needs. It would strive to maintain the small-town charm and quaintness that Manchester currently offers. Of parallel importance is the preservation of the spectacular views of the Puget Sound, the cosmopolitan city of Seattle, Cascade Mountain ranges, and the breathtaking view of Mount Rainier. Residents wish to maintain and enhance their high quality of life as well as the quality of the natural environment. Protection of wetlands, streams and wildlife habitat is highly emphasized. This can be accomplished by expanded infrastructure and environmental protections while maintaining Manchester's Village atmosphere for visitors and a safe and inviting home for residents.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Manchester Goal 1.

Increase public participation in the implementation of the Manchester Community Plan.

Manchester Policy 1.1. Use the Manchester community website and vehicles such as: Manchester Days, community activities (such as tree lighting) and the Manchester Community Association’s educational programs.

ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS

Manchester Goal 2.

Maintain and manage growth, density, zoning, and land use consistent with the requirements and policies of the Manchester LAMIRD.

Manchester Policy 2.1. Ensure development is consistent with existing community character.

Manchester Strategy 2.a. Maintain maximum height limits of 28 feet consistent with Manchester view protection overlay.

Manchester Strategy 2.b. Maintain and enforce existing code regarding legacy and nonconforming lots.

Manchester Strategy 2.c. Protect Manchester’s existing views including but not limited to Mt. Rainier, the Cascade Mountain Range, Puget Sound, and the Seattle skyline by addressing vegetation height and density regulations.

Manchester Strategy 2.d. All parking lots in the Commercial District should incorporate separate entrance and exit lanes, where possible.

Manchester Strategy 2.e. Increase available parking in the Manchester Village Commercial district by ensuring all new development in the Manchester Village Commercial district provides parking consistent with the Manchester Design Standards.

ENVIRONMENT

Manchester Goal 3.

Protect and enhance the shoreline resources that add to the unique character of the Manchester LAMIRD.

Manchester Policy 3.1. Coordinate with Port of Manchester to achieve a balanced use of their public shoreline facilities to create minimal environmental impact.

Manchester Policy 3.2. Educate the public on issues of wildlife habitat, critical area and shoreline protection, stormwater management and air quality.

Manchester Policy 3.3. Create a plant list that includes native, water retaining, non-invasive, and height-limited vegetation, to encourage replanting native tree and plant species on all properties.

TRANSPORTATION

Manchester Goal 4.

Provide the residents the opportunity to participate in the development of transportation planning policy regarding street designs and development patterns that accommodate pedestrians, vehicles, transit users and bicyclists in a balanced way.

Manchester Policy 4.1. All future County projects including but not limited to Beach Dr., Colchester Dr., Chester Rd., Main Street, Madrone Street, Alaska Avenue and California Avenue, should include continuous paved trails/bike lanes for non-motorized use.

Manchester Policy 4.2. Involve the Manchester Community Advisory Committee in the Kitsap County Public Works transportation improvement planning (TIP) process to provide input for and act on all public works plans that affect the Manchester LAMIRD.

Manchester Goal 5.

Encourage design practices to reduce accidents and potential accidents by providing a safe transportation system.

Manchester Policy 5.1. Assess opportunities for traffic calming techniques to improve safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles, where feasible.

CAPITAL FACILITIES AND UTILITIES

Manchester Goal 6.

Provide the availability of sewer service to all residents within the Manchester LAMIRD boundary without expansion of the existing sewer treatment plant.

Manchester Policy 6.1. Provide education to property owners on benefits to sewer service versus existing septic systems.



Manchester Goal 7.

Encourage expansion of the sewer system to all properties within the Manchester LAMIRD boundary through the formation of utility local improvement districts (ULIDs) and other mechanisms.

Manchester Policy 7.1. Require property owners along shorelines or near wetlands or streams to connect to the sewer system if their current system has failed.

Manchester Goal 8.

Support development of a comprehensive approach to stormwater management that encourages coordination between transportation, sewer, stormwater, and private development projects.

Manchester Policy 8.1. Involve the Manchester community in the assessment and prioritization of stormwater capital facility projects.

Manchester Policy 8.2. Continue to identify areas needing improved stormwater infrastructure within Manchester.

Manchester Goal 9.

Promote stormwater management systems that preserve natural drainage systems, such as streams, and construct facilities that complement these systems by taking advantage of opportunities for filtration, infiltration, and flow control where feasible.

Manchester Policy 9.1. Encourage the use of permeable surfaces and other Low Impact Development technologies in new building construction and property development.

Manchester Policy 9.2. Educate property owners through public outreach on the benefits and potential implications when new stormwater regulations are proposed.

Manchester Policy 9.3. Assess cumulative impacts of development on surrounding properties and minimize negative consequences of stormwater runoff on properties.

Manchester Goal 10.

Maintain clear communication between government agencies including the Kitsap Public Health District and Kitsap Sewer Utility as it relates to septic and sewer issues.

Manchester Policy 10.1. Provide materials for residents regarding the importance of septic system maintenance and the process for connection to the public sewer system.

PUBLIC FACILITIES AND PARKS

Manchester Goal 11.

Ensure public participation for future improvements to public facilities and parks within the Manchester LAMIRD.

Manchester Policy 11.1. Develop strategies for balancing private property rights with public benefit when furthering the public's interest in the waterfront, views, and recreation.

Manchester Goal 12.

Maintain current public facilities.

Manchester Policy 12.1. Coordinate with the Friends of the Manchester Library, the Manchester Foundation Board, and the Port of Manchester Commissioners and Kitsap County concerning any development plans for public facility improvements and additions.

Manchester Goal 13.

Plan for a community center within Manchester.

Manchester Policy 13.1. Encourage discussion of a future community center with groups, agencies, non-profits, and residents to find a location and secure funding for construction.

Manchester Goal 14.

Expand pedestrian and biking paths.

Manchester Policy 14.1. Develop public right-of ways for the purpose of creating trails and providing foot access along and between the main thoroughfares to connect with Mosquito Fleet Trail and Kitsap Peninsula Water Trails.

Manchester Policy 14.2. Create a walkability map of the Manchester LAMIRD.





SILVERDALE, WA

CHAPTER 12

Silverdale Regional Center Subarea Plan

Silverdale Regional Center Subarea Plan

INTRODUCTION

The Silverdale Urban Growth Area (UGA), located in Central Kitsap County at the north end of Dyes Inlet, was established in 1998 with the adoption of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. In 2006, as part of the adoption of the 10-year update to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan, the Silverdale UGA was expanded to encompass approximately 7,400 acres, the Silverdale Subarea Plan was adopted, and Draft Silverdale Design Guidelines were referenced in the Integrated Comprehensive Plan and Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

In 2003, the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies and Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) recognized portions of the Silverdale UGA as a Regional Growth Center for employment and population. Regional growth centers are intended to be dense and diverse urban centers with a regional focus on significant business, cultural, governmental, residential, and recreational activities. Development should result in compact and centralized working, shopping and activity areas linked by transit. PSRC's VISION 2050 includes a goal of attracting 65% of regional population growth and 75% of employment growth to centers and high-capacity transit station areas.


In 2018 and 2020, PSRC updated and more clearly defined the minimum requirements for a Regional Center through the Regional Centers Framework and VISION 2050. In 2021, the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) updated Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies to stay consistent with PSRC's Regional Centers Framework and ensure Silverdale is a Regional Center.

PSRC requirements establish minimum requirements for jobs and population, known as "activity units". Each resident or job counts as one activity unit. To be designated as a regional center, Silverdale Regional Center must have at least 18 current activity units per acre and a planned target of 45 activity units per acre. As of 2024, the Silverdale Regional Center is 717 acres and includes 15.8 activity units.

In the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, targeted growth for the overall Silverdale UGA includes 11,416 new jobs and 9,896 new people in the 20-year time horizon through 2044. A large share of that growth is planned to occur within Silverdale Regional Center boundary, with capacity for 6,751 additional jobs and 3,557 additional people. Regional Centers may receive additional focus and funding at regional scale. For the County, Silverdale is a place where hallmark planning efforts can take shape, transforming into a hub of economic activity and cultural importance.



Figure 32. Silverdale Regional Center Planning Area and Boundary



VISION FOR SILVERDALE REGIONAL CENTER

The Silverdale Regional Center Plan (Plan) will guide the evolution of the Silverdale Regional Center from a collection of strip malls and office buildings into a more livable, sustainable, and balanced mixed use urban area serving everyday essentials to residents, employees, and visitors. In accordance with the PSRC regional growth center designation criteria, the Plan will:

- Include a vision for the center that describes the role (economic, residential, cultural, etc.) of the center within the county and region;
- Clearly identify the boundaries of the regional growth center;
- Describes the relationship of the Plan to the County’s Comprehensive Plan, PSRC Vision 2050, and countywide planning policies; and
- Include a market analysis of the regional growth center’s development potential.

Significant housing and job population increases over the next 20 years will transform Silverdale. A key component of the Plan is channeling anticipated growth of Silverdale Urban Growth Area into the Silverdale Regional Center. This will protect the character and scale of Silverdale’s existing neighborhoods while also setting a vision for new and evolving neighborhoods within the Center. The result: a far more vibrant urban community with convenient access to commercial, service, and cultural activities.

Silverdale’s substantial Dyes Inlet waterfront and upland water views are the Regional Center’s biggest visual and physical amenity. Protecting and enhancing this asset will play a big role in the community’s growth and character. Public assets include the Silverdale Waterfront Park, Old Mill Park, Clear Creek Trail, Port of Silverdale Boat Ramp, and Bayshore Drive. Numerous private developments and businesses take advantage of the waterfront setting, including the Christa Shores Senior Living complex, Best Western Plus Silverdale Beach, Oxford Suites Silverdale, Golden Tides II, the Yacht Club broiler, among other establishments. Further enhancing access to the waterfront and promoting infill development that strengthens the community’s waterfront character and setting is essential.

Figure 33. Silverdale’s Dyes Inlet waterfront setting and upland views.



A multimodal network linking the waterfront amenities with other destinations, parks, riparian corridors, tree lined streets, active and passive plazas, and other shared urban spaces, is fundamental to the Silverdale Regional Center’s livability. Connectivity will be achieved by incentivizing mixed use developments and providing easy, safe, and enjoyable walk, bike, roll, transit, and vehicle connections to residential, retail shopping, major public facilities, open space, and connections between communities. A vibrant retail core and strong residential community can be sustained and enhanced by making walk, bike, and roll circulation a priority.

Figure 34. A vision for Silverdale: a mixed-use center with welcoming streetscapes and open spaces



The Urban Community & Design, Connectivity & Mobility, Environment, Economic Development and Housing Elements in this Plan lay the groundwork for urban density development that creates a sense of place, promotes an active transportation system for pedestrians, cyclists, transit, and cars, and protects and includes the natural environment - all without sacrificing Silverdale’s existing character and vitality. The Silverdale Regional Center’s growth and transformation will not happen overnight. Key capital investments in multimodal transportation facilities that connect parks and open spaces will encourage and support the redevelopment of the Silverdale Regional Center.

To accomplish our goal of transforming Silverdale, we must take action: Grow density, increase investment, seek out and welcome both new development and redevelopment; encourage forward-thinking opportunities that redefine the intersection between retail and residential. This, all while highlighting and providing greater access to Old Town, Dyes Inlet, and the remarkable views of water and mountains that surround Silverdale will enable it to become a first- class waterfront city.

“AN EMERGING DOWNTOWN”

Downtown Silverdale is an unincorporated regional growth center with different types of commercial, office, civic and residential patterns. There is no coherent or integrated downtown/community center area because of the historical, incremental growth pattern. However, most of the activities and functions of a downtown and civic/community center are present. Lacking are well-defined nodes, a

compact human-scale, and strong physical and circulation connectors between and among the various places and districts.

Shopping centers throughout North America are undergoing significant design changes due to market forces, competition, and aging malls. Due to these pressures, a changing development pattern will benefit the long-term viability and health of Silverdale. For example, closings of some large-scale retailers in other similar centers have created opportunities for compact pedestrian-oriented residential and mixed-use redevelopment. Such changes can help to create a true “center” for communities and spur similar developments on adjacent properties. As large areas of Silverdale’s Regional Center are devoted to large scale retail uses, these areas provide opportunities for future transformation into a “Town Center”, with mixed-use developments of residential, office, retail, civic, and cultural uses.

Town Centers often serve as a focus of community life for surrounding areas. They provide basic retail services and gathering or leisure places for residents. They contain shared parking, provide town squares or village greens as central gathering areas, and capitalize on natural environmental features as desired amenities. The residential uses are deemed the “glue” for Town Centers, providing an on-site population. Libraries, community centers, exercise facilities and other public or semi-public uses are often included.

SILVERDALE CONTEXT

This section documents subarea assets, challenges, and opportunities plus the physical context, population, housing, and employment characteristics, the transportation context, development characteristics and trends, and open space patterns.

ASSETS

Silverdale is a regional commercial center with a wide range of retail and service uses and amenities, including:

- **Healthy regional center.** Silverdale is centrally located to serve the greater Kitsap Peninsula and is healthy economically.
- **Waterfront setting.** The considerable Dyes Inlet shoreline serves as one of the character-defining features of the subarea in terms of views and as a recreational amenity.
- **Diversity of shops and services.** Silverdale features a great variety of retail and service businesses, eateries that serve the local and regional community.
- **Centralized in the regional transportation network.** Located at the junction of State Routes 3 and 303, it’s easy to get to and from Silverdale from anywhere on the Kitsap peninsula.
- **Clear Creek corridor.** Clear creek and its corresponding trail and riparian corridor is a visual, recreational, and environmental amenity centralized within the subarea. The corridor has and will continue to be an attractive draw for residential development.



- **Schools, parks, and recreational uses.** The subarea is rich with schools and recreational amenities, including the recently rebuilt Central Kitsap Middle School and High School, the new Haselwood Family YMCA, Silverdale Waterfront Park, Old Mill Park, and Linder Softball fields.

CHALLENGES

Silverdale does not feature a coherent “center” due in part to its incremental development pattern, outer suburban location near the junction of two state highways, and the lack of plan to create a community. Key challenges:

- **No identifiable center.** Like many other outer suburbs that were developed late in the 20th Century, Silverdale lacks a true pedestrian-oriented focal point. This makes it more challenging to create an identifiable center, let alone encourage pedestrian oriented forms of development.
- **Arterial dominated road network.** The limited network of streets and large-scale retail development pattern has created a context of superblocks that creates circulation challenges for all modes of travel, particularly non-motorized forms. The resulting form creates an unwelcoming environment for pedestrians.
- **Market conditions for compact urban development.** The outer suburb location and auto-dominated character create a challenging environment for encouraging the compact pedestrian-oriented forms of development that are desired for the subarea.
- **Disjointed land uses.** The incremental and unplanned nature and form of development in much of the subarea has created a disjointed development pattern where uses are often disconnected to all other uses around them. This makes it hard to create synergy between uses and promote walking.

Figure 35. Big box retail stores and large parking lots dominate the visual character of Silverdale



OPPORTUNITIES

Despite the challenges noted above, Silverdale features enough assets that when combined with thoughtful planning, enhanced development regulations, and community management and leadership, that the subarea can achieve its vision:

- **Emphasize and enhance the Waterfront.** Prioritize waterfront areas and connections to the waterfront with public improvements and updates to zoning and design regulations that enhance the character, visibility, and accessibility of the Waterfront.
- **Plan for enhanced connectivity.** Identify future connections and update zoning and design provisions that integrate new pedestrian and vehicular connections in conjunction with new development.
- **Today's parking lots are tomorrow's development opportunity.** Kitsap Mall's large parking lots and other large parking lots serving big box stores provide some of Silverdale's best opportunity areas to transform the area into a vibrant pedestrian-oriented mixed-use community. Update zoning and design provisions to anticipate this change.
- **Orient to trails.** Clear Creek Trail is a tremendous asset to Silverdale and zoning and design regulations could be updated to promote development that orients towards the trail and riparian corridor as an amenity.
- **Build upon the unique character of Old Town.** Zoning and design regulations could be updated to reinforce and enhance Old Town's human scaled development pattern.



- **Be strategic and opportunistic.** The mix of current uses, large parcel ownership patterns, and evolving business and real estate environment, require that Silverdale and the County will need to be strategic in terms of investment and partnerships to ultimately achieve the community’s vision. Particularly as some sites may continue current uses and development forms through the plan’s 20-year time horizon, whereas some unexpected vacancies may arrive on sites owned by forward thinking property owners.


Figure 36. Old Town Silverdale



PHYSICAL CONTEXT

Key features that help define Silverdale’s physical context include:

- Dyes Inlet and its northern shoreline
- Clear Creek and riparian corridor extending south into Dyes Inlet from the Silverdale highlands to the west, north and east
- Wetlands to the north/northeast of downtown, buffering downtown from Highway 303
- Strawberry Creek and riparian corridor extending south and east into Dyes Inlet from West Hill
- An underground drainage in a culvert that flows into Dyes Inlet at Bay Shore Drive, referred to in the design guidelines as “Silverdale Creek”
- Wooded slopes along the eastern edge of West Hill Neighborhood and along the western slopes of lower Bucklin Ridge south of Highway 303
- Old Town, a compact block grid district along the northwest shoreline of Dyes Inlet
- A regional commercial and office center, with Kitsap Mall as the dominant retail type (enclosed mall).



POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT CHARACTERISTICS

In 2022, the population in the Silverdale Regional Center was 2,270 people and includes 1,371 total housing units. Silverdale provides a total of 8,740 jobs and continues to be an important economic center that contributes to the regional economy, however, a more balanced ratio of housing units to jobs would improve the vitality of the area.

Jobs in Silverdale are most heavily focused in the Services and Retail Sectors, at 56% and 29% respectively. With the expansion of St. Michael Medical Center, Silverdale will continue to play an important role in servicing the County’s growing health care needs.

To service a housing need to all household incomes, the County will need to focus on diversifying its housing stock, with much of that effort taking place in Silverdale. In 2021, 19% of the housing in the Center was Single-Family detached, 28.4% moderate-low density, 21.1% moderate-high density, and 31% high density. Many residents in Center are renters, and 29.8% of those renters are considered “cost



burdened” and 29% considered “severely cost-burdened”, which is higher than both the region and for other Regional Growth Centers.

TRANSPORTATION AND STREET NETWORK


The Principle Arterial Street network consists of Silverdale Way (north – south) and Kitsap Mall Blvd/Ridgetop Blvd (east – west) providing the primary access to and cross routes for the Center. The Minor Arterial Street network consist of Mickelberry Rd., Myhre Rd., and Randell Way (north – south) and Bucklin Hill Rd., Anderson Hill Rd., Randle Way, and Myhre Rd. (east – west) providing significant secondary connections to and within the Center. This Arterial system forms large or “super” blocks within the Center.

Internal vehicle movement within the super blocks is by a small number of local County roads, private roads, large commercial driveways, and through large and small parking lots. The local road/driveway network has a wide range of functional, access, and designs.

Major connectivity challenges exist, such as:

- Major arterials with five lanes act as barriers between districts and make an uncomfortable environment for pedestrians.
- Shopping plazas are setback from the street, disconnected from streets by large surface parking lots.
- Old Town is a small peninsula oriented to Dyes Inlet and bounded and contained essentially by Silverdale Way and Bucklin Hill Road.
- West Hill Neighborhood is insulated from the remainder of downtown by a sharp rise in topography along its eastern edge.

Figure 37. Silverdale connectivity challenges and possible future connections



Silverdale features an automobile-oriented street grid with very large blocks. The lack of internal connectivity not only makes it harder to get around by car, bicycle, and vehicles, it forces more traffic onto the arterials such as Silverdale Way. Proposed regulatory concepts can help to improve connectivity over time by requiring new streets and/or other through-block connections in conjunction with new development.

BUILDING CONFIGURATIONS AND TYPES

Buildings in Silverdale, excluding major portions of Old Town and the West Hill Neighborhood, are shopping malls, shopping centers and plazas composed of one-story commercial buildings oriented to large surface parking areas, and stand-alone commercial or office buildings with parking on two to four sides of the buildings. Pedestrian entrances for most buildings are from the parking lots rather than streets. Most buildings have individual access drives to arterials, are one-story in height with higher buildings at Kitsap Mall, Bucklin Hill Road/Silverdale Way intersection, Northeast Business Park, and a scattering throughout downtown.



DEVELOPMENT CHARACTERISTICS AND TRENDS

Silverdale is typical of outer suburbs of the greater Puget Sound area largely developed after World War II in terms of low-scaled auto-oriented development forms. This includes:

- Single-story commercial areas served by large parking lots on two to four sides of buildings.
- Walk-up apartment developments also dominated by surrounding surface parking lots.
- Single family subdivisions around the perimeter of commercial areas.
- Scattered mid to late century larger lot single family homes (some of which have been replaced by development types above).

Silverdale is unique in that it includes a large hospital and spin-off medical facilities and office buildings. Outside of Kitsap Mall, these are the largest buildings in Silverdale.

Recent local developments and regional trends indicate that these development forms will continue and/or emerge in the near future in Silverdale:

- Adaptive reuse of existing commercial buildings. While the brick-and-mortar retail environment have faced increasing regional and national challenges due to online retailing, Silverdale's retail environment, based on the very limited number of vacancies, appears very resilient. If and when one store leaves, another use typically replaces it and often makes tenant improvements.
- Increasing demand for apartments, including increasingly larger buildings and developments. While there may still be some viability for three-story garden apartments, larger four and five-story buildings may become more common in Silverdale, depending on the context (particularly sites with views).
- Vintage at Silverdale has proven that there is a market for senior housing in the subarea. This market will likely grow soon, given demographics, local medical infrastructure, and other community amenities.
- Townhouse developments are likely to become more popular, given their efficiency and desire for homeownership.

OPEN SPACE PATTERNS

Silverdale has an open space pattern represented by natural features such as Dyes Inlet and shoreline, Strawberry Creek and riparian corridor, Clear Creek and riparian corridor, and wooded slopes to the west in West Hill Neighborhood and to the northeast in the Northeast Business Park. The existing Community Campus site provides tree cover and open space. Kitsap Mall provides a privately owned

enclosed pedestrian mall and courts for consumers using that facility. There is a deficiency of pedestrian open space in the commercial development pattern of downtown Silverdale.

The natural open space pattern forms a north/south “V” shape within Silverdale, providing an existing open space spine that extends from Dyes Inlet on the south edge of downtown to Highway 303. Strawberry Creek drains out of West Hill to and through Old Town and into Dyes Inlet. A drainage channel, named “Silverdale Creek” for reference in the guidelines, enters Dyes Inlet immediately southeast of Bucklin Hill Road and Bay Shore Drive.

SILVERDALE REGIONAL CENTER GOALS AND POLICIES

URBAN COMMUNITY AND DESIGN

Vision: Inspire a healthy, inter-connected urban community where pedestrians are priority, buildings and open space are openly inter-related, the site and design makes a positive contribution to the public realm, and ultimately, people thrive in vibrancy, whether working or living in Silverdale.

Goal 1. Compact, urban, pedestrian-oriented community

Create a compact, visually attractive, mixed use, urban community that prioritizes pedestrian safety and comfort and enhances the quality of life for all who live, work, or visit the Silverdale Regional Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.1. Adopt and update development and design standards which prioritize urban form and quality pedestrian-oriented development. Key elements include:

- Streetscape design standards to ensure that sidewalk widths, street tree, landscaping, lighting, and street furniture provisions meet the community’s vision.
- Block frontage standards that identify areas where pedestrian-oriented storefronts should be required versus encouraged, standards for ground level residential uses to help create a welcoming streetscape while providing privacy for residents, and identifying where off-street parking areas adjacent to the street are appropriate versus inappropriate.
- Standards for development frontages along Clear Creek Trail to enhance the safety and character of the trail, while better using the trail as an amenity for development.
- Standards for how commercial, mixed-use, and multifamily developments address the design of side and rear yards to create coordinated development (where possible) while enhancing the design and livability of developments.
- For medium to large sized retail uses, include modest pedestrian-oriented space standards to ensure that some combination of wider sidewalks, courtyards, and open spaces are integrated into the development.



- Minimum useable open space /recreation standards for residential development that are reasonable and necessary for community livability.
- Internal pedestrian access standards to help create a functional and welcoming pedestrian environment.
- Landscaping standards that enhance the character and livability of developments, while buffering undesirable views.
- Service element design standards to ensure that these elements are thoughtfully integrated into the development and minimize impacts to livability.
- Building massing and articulation standards to ensure that buildings employ features to reduce the perceived scale of large buildings and enrich the streetscape and visual character of the community.
- Standards requiring the integration of design details and small-scale elements into building façades that are attractive at a pedestrian scale.
- Building materials standards that help ensure the use of quality building materials and design treatments that enhance the character of buildings.
- Standards that ensure that there are no large untreated blank walls facing the street in commercial, multifamily, and mixed-use areas.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.2. Foster the development of a pedestrian-oriented retail/mixed-use focal point for Silverdale. This can be accomplished by:

- Collaborating and where possible, partnering with property owners and developers of key properties on such plans.
- Creating block frontage standards identified in Policy 1.1 to identify the location and extent, or opportunities, for such main street or pedestrian-oriented retail focal point and craft the standards to ensure that new development implements that vision.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.3. Coordinate, and where possible, partner with property owners and developers to integrate pedestrian, bicycle, and gathering space amenities into developments.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.4. Promote pedestrian-oriented development to encourage human-scale connectivity within the Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.5. Reduce the number of drive-through developments in the center to promote pedestrian-oriented development.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.6. Strengthen the pedestrian connections from existing Kitsap Mall concourses to surrounding streets. This can occur by extending the enclosed concourses towards the street and/or by constructing pedestrian and open space improvements.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 1.7. Promote the integration of “Quadrangle” and courtyard open space features as a part of the Northeast Business District development pattern.

Goal 2. Waterfront community

Emphasize and enhance Silverdale’s waterfront as a character-defining feature of the community.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 2.1. Evaluate and update current zoning and design standards to ensure that new development enhances the pedestrian environment and the visual character of the waterfront.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 2.2. Collaborate with property owners and developers to help foster development that enhances the pedestrian environment and the visual character of the waterfront.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 2.3. Enhance the community’s physical and visual connection to the waterfront via public improvements, updating connectivity standards for new development, and coordinating with property owners and developers to facilitate improvements.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 2.4. Prioritize pedestrian and streetscape improvements in Old Town to enhance the neighborhood’s visual character, safety, and access to the waterfront. This is most critical at intersections.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 2.5. Prioritize the maintenance and improvement of Silverdale Waterfront Park, Clear Creek Trail, and other public waterfront lands on Dyles Inlet.

Goal 3. Parks and open space

Create a system of interconnected parks, open space, trail systems that serve the needs of all Silverdale residents.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.1. Make parks and open space accessible to all ages and ability, with specific attention to the needs and locations of vulnerable populations.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.2. Provide well-landscaped, non-motorized connections and locate them in areas that link the Waterfront with other destinations, parks, riparian corridors, and other shared urban spaces.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.3. Improve and extend the existing Clear Creek Trail network in conjunction with redevelopment activity on adjacent sites and by supporting a public/private partnership to increase connectivity to surrounding uses. Provide for viewing facilities, pedestrian bridge(s) and continuous trails and paths along both sides of the creek. The trail shall be identified as an important connection to surrounding pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure.



Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.4. Expand an interconnected system of nonmotorized trails and parks to increase mobility within Silverdale, provide health and transportation benefits, emphasize recreational benefits and connect to the larger, regional land and water trail systems.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.5. Prioritize and invest in new parks, open space and trail projects within the regional center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.6. Promote the development of Complete Streets and Green Streets throughout Silverdale Connect existing and planned parks and open space with a network of Complete Streets, Green Streets and Trails.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.7. Integrate natural features such as wetlands, riparian corridors, and hillside views into site design as amenities. Protect them as environmental resources and provide access to the natural landscape.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.8. Include native and low maintenance landscaping installations with new road, pathway, and development projects.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.9. Develop mechanisms to maintain landscaping throughout Silverdale Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.10. Encourage and pursue the integration of plazas and open spaces, such as Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS), in commercial and mixed-use areas that promote shoppers to linger and provide amenities to residents and employees.

Figure 38. Examples of integrated plazas and open spaces.



Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.11. Allow partial fee-in-lieu payments of onsite open space requirements to fund central park areas and trails.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 3.12. If and when Kitsap Mall redevelops with urban residential and mixed-uses, integrate open space, parks, and/or plazas into the development, particularly along the southern and eastern edges of the mall.

Goal 4: Urban development standards

Establish development standards based on urban, rather than suburban densities and needs.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 4.1. Strategically increase building heights and density to promote pedestrian-oriented forms of development that can be served by structured and underground parking.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 4.2. Evaluate and update dimensional standards to help facilitate pedestrian-oriented forms of development.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 4.3. Reduce minimum parking requirements to help facilitate pedestrian-oriented forms of development.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 4.4. Codify established design standards and redevelopment standards.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 4.5. Establish incentives for desired development types and forms through enhanced or expedited permit processes.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 4.6. Evaluate and simplify design standards to provide a higher level of predictability while integrating strategic provisions for flexibility.

CONNECTIVITY AND MOBILITY

Vision: *Create a multi-modal transportation system that supports an increasing number of people living, working, and visiting Silverdale and increases the ability to access destinations without the need for a personal automobile.*

Goal 5: Coordinate transit and land use

Facilitate a coordinated land use and transportation pattern that reduces the reliance on the single occupancy vehicles (SOV).

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.1. Implement transportation demand management and commute trip reduction strategies.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.2. Promote transit ridership to reduce per capita VMT and greenhouse gas emissions.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.3. Collaborate with Kitsap Transit to improve the speed and reliability of transit service in Silverdale.



Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.4. Ensure public transit services within the Center, Silverdale UGA, and surrounding communities have routing, frequencies, and levels of service to promote public transit as a viable alternative for daily transportation needs within and between communities and which supports the County's land uses.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.5. Ensure that Express and Bus Rapid Transit services providing services between communities are routed through and provide direct access within the Silverdale, Central Kitsap, and Bremerton Urban Growth Areas to support access and mobility within the communities and connections between communities.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.6. Collaborate with Kitsap Transit to provide an alternative to SOV trips, including commute trip reduction, shared vehicles (i.e., Zip Cars, Scoot Cars) Bike Share, ORCA card passes, and other strategies.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.7. Promote and support Transit Oriented Development in coordination with Kitsap Transit, primarily by increasing population and employment density near high-capacity transit stations.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 5.8. Invest private and public funds in architecture and circulation facility design that supports transit choices such as transit facing entries, weather protection and pedestrian connections between buildings and community spaces, and transit stop spacing that supports fast, efficient transit.

Goal 6: Transportation network

Create a street and pathway system that supports the land use and transportation vision for the re-development of Silverdale.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.1. Maintain a seamless, interconnected, safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle network to build a reputation of a Silverdale as a bicycle and pedestrian-friendly community.

Figure 40. Bicycle infrastructure examples.



Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.2. Create connectivity/maximum block size standards that apply to new large-site development and redevelopment. Specifically:


- The standards should be tiered to allow larger block sizes provided through-block connections are integrated to enhance connectivity.
- The standards for block sizes should vary depending on the zone and corresponding permitted intensity of development, with those areas emphasizing a mixture of pedestrian-oriented commercial and multifamily blocks being the smallest (no more than 300 feet long between a street and through-block connection).
- Through-block connections may be a mixture of private streets, alleys, woonerfs (narrow curb-less routes designed to allow pedestrians and vehicles to share the same lane), and pedestrian-only connections.

Figure 41. Examples of through-block connections



A woonerf, or shared street (left image), a landscaped passageway (middle), and an urban passageway (right image).

Figure 42. Circulation network example integrating public streets and through-block connections



Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.3. Promote the desired urban form of Silverdale by focusing first on street design and streetscapes.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.4. Design streetscapes that are safe and inviting for pedestrians and alternative walk, bike, and roll. This includes providing simple design standards for building frontages along public and private streets and through-block connections to help ensure that there's "eyes on the street" and other Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.5. When locating and designing facilities within the Active Transportation System, consider the health and equity impacts on vulnerable populations, including low- income, children, the elderly, and those with disabilities.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.6. Pursue County Road Improvement District (CRID) and Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) options for the Silverdale Regional Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.7. Partner with Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) and local property owners to improve connections between arterial streets and state highways.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.8. Invest in multimodal transportation infrastructure that offers an alternative to single-occupancy vehicle travel and encourages a mix of travel choices.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.9. Consider interlocal ferries as a multimodal transportation option.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 6.10. Create a wayfinding signage program with a priority on gateway signage.



ENVIRONMENT

Vision: *Build a community that features nature into this developing urban community, creates landscapes that restore both nature and human activity, and cares for and preserves the natural environment for ourselves and future generations.*

Goal 7: Stormwater

Improve stormwater quality and management.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 7.1. Coordinate development with stormwater detention and treatment as part of the larger regional stormwater system.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 7.2. Incentivize development that utilizes Low Impact Development (LID) Practices which improve stormwater quality and runoff flow control beyond minimum standards.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 7.3. To protect wildlife habitat areas and minimize adverse stormwater impacts, minimize grading of landforms and the extent of soil and vegetation disturbance in new development.

Goal 8: Enhance critical areas

Enhance wetlands and the riparian corridors to improve environmental functions and fish and wildlife habitat.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 8.1. Incentivize the restoration or rehabilitation of wetlands and riparian corridors as part of new development or re-development. Encourage clustering of development in a manner that both preserves and celebrates these areas as amenities to nearby development.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 8.2. Connect natural areas to stream corridors and open spaces outside the Silverdale Regional Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 8.3. Promote the integration of interpretive signage along nature trails that helps to educate users to the features and benefits of wetlands and riparian corridors.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 8.4. Collaborate with property owners to ensure the completion of creek restoration or revitalization plans.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 8.5. Enhance Strawberry Creek and riparian corridor by including an expanded riparian area in the vicinity of Linder Field and Silverdale Way, public access or viewing facilities, trails, and paths along key portions of creek, and public access at the confluence of the creek and Dyes Inlet.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 8.6. Protect and enhance Silverdale Creek through daylighting where feasible as a part of private development north of Bucklin Hill Road.

Goal 9: Sustainable community

Create a sustainable community, consistent with Kitsap County's Comprehensive Plan Sustainability Policies.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 9.1. Support projects that increase air quality, reduce carbon emissions, or reduce climate change impacts.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 9.2. Support electric transportation infrastructure and provide incentives for commercial or multifamily developments that include Level 2 or 3 charging stations.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 9.3. Establish a Sustainability Building Strategy for Silverdale. Maintain innovation as a key to the County's sustainability efforts.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 9.4. Encourage buildings and infrastructure in the public and private sectors which:

- Use less energy and have a lower climate impact.
- Use recycled water to reduce consumption of potable water.
- Are less toxic and healthier.
- Increase filtration and circulation of clean air more frequently.
- Incorporate recycled, third party green certified, and locally produced materials.
- Reduce stormwater runoff.
- Provide wildlife habitat.
- Use green building technologies, products, and processes.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 9.5. Support the development of community gardens as a valid option to comply with an open space requirement.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 9.6. Retain existing trees in critical areas and their buffers, along designated pedestrian corridors and in other urban green spaces. Plant new trees at all available opportunities, recognizing their micro-climate, urban design, health, and livability benefits.



Goal 10: Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions

Develop greenhouse gas emissions reduction ratio targets and achieve them through land use, transportation, commercial and residential building construction, and site development strategies.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 10.1. Strive to meet GHG emissions targets set in VISION 2050.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 10.2. Pursue an Energy and Climate Plan for Silverdale.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 10.3. Emphasize and incentivize compact mixed-use and transit-oriented development forms in the Silverdale Regional Center so that people living in close proximity have convenient access to goods and services, preferably within walkable distances.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 10.5. Support a multi-modal transportation system so that all people who live and work in the Center have a variety of convenient low- or no-emission transportation options.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 10.6. Establish a program to support energy efficiency retrofits of existing buildings which will not be redeveloped in the short term.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 10.7. Work with Puget Sound Energy to expand participation in the Green Power Program.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Vision: *Foster re-development through processes that balance flexibility and predictability, effective use of financial incentives, and cultivation of public/private partnerships that result in mutually beneficial solutions.*

Goal 12: Economic growth

Maintain Silverdale's economic engine by accommodating and attracting most of the anticipated job and housing growth for the Silverdale Urban Growth Area in the Regional Growth Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 12.1. Promote up-front investments and placemaking strategies that act as a catalyst for redevelopment.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 12.2. Invest in infrastructure—in advance of residential, commercial, and industrial development when necessary—to encourage new development or re-development in support of planned growth.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 12.3. Require conduit and/or fiber to be installed as part of all street and utility projects that are at least one block in length.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 12.4. Craft design standards that enhance the livability of developments by creating safe and inviting pedestrian routes, integrating open spaces and amenities, and creating attractive and welcoming block frontages. Such improvements will then enhance the setting for subsequent nearby development.

Goal 13: Effective outreach

Educate the public about the benefits associated with the Silverdale Regional Growth Center planning efforts.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 13.1. Work with the Greater Kitsap Chamber, the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance and other cooperating agencies and groups to promote the Silverdale Regional Growth Center as a desirable destination to live, work, and play. This also should include efforts that support business formation, retention, expansion, and recruitment in Silverdale.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 13.2. Collaborate with key stakeholders and landowners to envision redevelopment projects that include significant public benefit.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 13.3. Improve access and visibility of old town Silverdale.

HOUSING

Vision: *Nurture a community that accommodates a diversity of income levels, activities, amenities, open spaces, gathering places, recreation, and mobility options that all contribute to a self-sustaining community where people aspire to live, work and play.*

Goal 14: Housing growth

Locate a majority of Silverdale Urban Growth Area housing growth in the Silverdale Regional Growth Center.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 14.1. Strategically increase building heights and density together with strengthening design standards to enhance the character and livability of new developments.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 14.2. Incentivize the development of higher density residential buildings in the Silverdale Regional Center. Examples of incentives may include:

- Increased height allowance and/or reduced parking requirements for projects that commit to frontage improvements, affordable housing provisions, senior housing provisions, mixed use development, or additional open space provisions.
- County government fee reductions.



- Expedited permitting.
- Use of incentives authorized by the State of Washington.
- Design elements that support multi-modal transportation.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 14.3. Streamline and customize regulations to fit the needs of infill and redevelopment. Regulations shall reduce barriers and provide incentives to foster infill and higher intensity development.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 14.4. In preparation for housing growth, create strategies to avoid displacement and preserve existing affordable housing units.

Goal 15: Housing Diversity

Prioritize the development of housing across all income levels in Silverdale, including but not limited to worker, middle-income, and low- and moderate-income housing.

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 15.1. Create and implement a multifamily tax incentives (MFTE) program, including a 12-year option for projects that include affordable housing (See Appendix B).

Silverdale Regional Center Policy 15.2. Monitor effectiveness of policies overtime, specifically focusing on creation of new housing types and availability to various income segments.

IMPLEMENTATION

Short Term: 0-3 years

Medium Term: 4-7 years

Long Term: 7+ Years

Ongoing

Figure 43. Silverdale Regional Center Implementation Table

Action	Timeline	Responsibility
Urban Community and Design		
Adopt and update development and design standards which prioritize urban form and quality pedestrian-oriented development.	Short-Term	DCD; PW
Update design standards to consolidate and simplify design districts.	Short-Term	DCD
Strategically increase building heights and density and lower parking requirements to promote pedestrian-oriented forms of development.	Short-Term	DCD; PW
Conduct a parking study for the Silverdale Center area that includes community outreach and participation, data collection and analysis, and develops recommendations on new policies to right size future parking.	Short-Term	DCD; PW
Right-size parking minimums, and consider maximums, to limit how much parking is developed and ensure they are not resulting in a disconnect in the amount of parking provided and land use goals.	Short-Term	DCD
Collaborate and partner with property owners of key properties to: (1) Foster the development of a pedestrian-oriented retail/mixed-use focal point for Silverdale; (2) foster development that enhances the pedestrian environment and the visual character of the waterfront and (3) integrate pedestrian, bicycle, and gathering space amenities into developments.	Ongoing	DCD; PW



Action	Timeline	Responsibility
Define areas within the center where to focus streetscape improvements, storefronts and mixed-use development, and cultural focal points.	Short-Term	DCD
Evaluate Old Town for priority streetscape and pedestrian improvements, set priorities and update applicable streetscape design standards and develop improvement plans, and seek funding for the most critical improvements.	Medium Term	DCD; PW
Establish incentives for development through enhanced or expedited permit processes.	Short-Term	DCD
Establish diagrams and conceptual maps illustrating how Silverdale could evolve into a vibrant pedestrian-oriented mixed-use center over time. Such map(s) could illustrate future streets, through-block connections, and enhanced streetscapes plus preferred block types, lengths, and building orientation to be used by prospective future development and redevelopment projects.	Short-Term	DCD
Work with downtown business and downtown interests to improve streetscape details, such as street furnishings, streets trees, lighting, and art installations.	Ongoing	DCD; PW
Promote and host street activation by allowing innovative uses of low-traffic streets and parking lots, such as temporary street closures, festivals and events, and waiving any related fees for small events.	Ongoing	DCD, Parks and Recreation.
Establish regulations that prohibit the development of new drive-through businesses in pedestrian-oriented areas.	Short-Term	DCD
Encourage and pursue the integration of plazas and open spaces in commercial and mixed-use areas that promote shoppers to linger and provide amenities to residents and employees.	Short-Term, Ongoing	DCD
Connectivity and Mobility		
Implement transportation demand management (TDM) and commute trip reduction (CTR) strategies.	Ongoing	PW

Action	Timeline	Responsibility
Create and update mode split goals specific to Silverdale Regional Center that represent a significant increase in nonmotorized travel modes over time.	Short-Term	DCD/ PW
Explore funding for projects identified in the Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy	Ongoing	PW
Collaborate with Kitsap Transit to improve the speed and reliability of transit service in Silverdale, including the analysis and subsequent potential implementation of a bus circulator system for the downtown core, as well as the potential for ferry service for both workforce and tourism purposes.	Ongoing	DCD/ Kitsap Transit
Create a wayfinding signage program with a priority on gateway signage.	Medium Term	PW / DCD
Pursue a County Road Improvement District (CRID) and Utility Local Improvement District (ULID) options for the Silverdale Regional Center.	Medium Term	PW
Modify impact fees to ensure that development in the Silverdale Regional Center contributes its fair share to multi-modal transportation improvements.	Medium Term	PW
Pursue the adoption of funding mechanisms to incentivize and support transit and multi-modal transportation trips.	Short-Term	DCD/ PW
Work with Kitsap Transit and the long-range transit plan to plan around locations of future high-capacity transit (BRT) stations and service.	Ongoing	Kitsap Transit/ DCD
Work with Kitsap Transit to plan and implement fixed route and on-call transit services within Urban Growth Areas and subareas with routing, frequencies, and level of service to support use of transit within the community for daily transportation needs.	Ongoing	Kitsap Transit/ DCD
Create connectivity/maximum block size standards that apply to large site development and redevelopment.	Short-Term	DCD
Develop an alignment for an east-west multi-modal pathway through the Regional Center using a mix of off-street and on-street facilities.	Short-Term	DCD / PW



Action	Timeline	Responsibility
Link Clear Creek Trail with important downtown landmarks through improved streetscapes and trails.	Medium-Term	DCD/ PW
Develop new street sections and corridor standards for specific streets in the Center where mixed-use development and pedestrian activity is prioritized.	Short-Term	DCD/ PW
Support the reuse of surface parking lots for infill development.	Ongoing	DCD
Environment		
Identify the Silverdale Regional Center as a receiving site for the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program.	Short-Term	DCD
Identify and map possible locations and strategies for new pocket parks, neighborhood parks, and public space.	Short-Term	DCD, Parks
Ensure that stormwater infrastructure acts as an amenity for Silverdale.	Short-Term	DCD, PW
Coordinate development with stormwater detention and treatment as part of the larger regional stormwater system.	Ongoing	DCD, PW
Incentivize development that utilizes Low Impact Development (LID) Practices which improve stormwater quality and runoff flow control beyond minimum standards.	Medium-Term	DCD, PW
Evaluate and update grading standards to better ensure that such standards protect wildlife habitat areas and minimize adverse stormwater impacts.	Short-Term	DCD, PW
Evaluate and update development clustering provisions to preserves and celebrates wetlands and riparian corridors as amenities to nearby development.	Short-Term	DCD, PW
Promote the integration of interpretive signage along nature trails that helps to educate users to the features and benefits of wetlands and riparian corridors.	Ongoing	DCD, Parks
Establish a Sustainability Building Strategy for Silverdale. Maintain innovation as a key to the County's sustainability efforts.	Short-Term	DCD
Pursue an Energy and Climate Plan for Silverdale.	Short-Term	DCD

Action	Timeline	Responsibility
Establish a program to support energy efficiency retrofits of existing buildings which will not be redeveloped in the short term.	Short-Term	DCD
Work with Puget Sound Energy to expand participation in the Green Power Program.	Ongoing	DCD/PSE
Economic Development		
If needed based on current density, Complete a Market Study for the Regional Center	Short-Term	DCD
Consider a Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (PEIS) for the Silverdale Regional Center.	Medium-Term	DCD
Update design standards to require pedestrian-oriented storefronts key area(s) that are intended to function as the Center's most walkable area(s).	Short-Term	DCD
Identify groups or individuals that can lead a downtown advisory group to ensure interests are aligned in Silverdale's vision, investment, and activities.	Short-Term	DCD
Make strategic public investments in streetscape improvements, civic and recreational uses, infrastructure, or other amenities that catalyze new development patterns downtown.	Ongoing	DCD, PW
Create a masterplan for redevelopment of the Kitsap Mall area.	Long-Term	DCD – with collaboration of property owner(s)
Housing		
Strategically increase building heights and density while strengthening design standards to enhance the character and livability of new developments.	Short-Term	DCD
If made available to the County, create and implement a multifamily tax exemption (MFTE) program and evaluate including a 12-year option for projects that include affordable housing.	Short-Term	DCD



Action	Timeline	Responsibility
Monitor effectiveness of policies and regulations overtime, specifically focusing on creation of new housing types and availability to various income segments. To make sure that the Center’s housing targets are being achieved at various income levels. Identify additional steps (reasonable measures) to spur housing development if monitoring shows the housing goals for Silverdale are not being achieved.	Ongoing	DCD
Evaluate the effectiveness of incentives for housing development and adapt to respond to market trends.	Medium-Term	DCD
Partner with housing organizations and community groups to address issues of homelessness, fair housing, anti-displacement strategies.	Short-Term	DCD; Human Services



SILVERDALE, WA

CHAPTER 13

Silverdale Subarea Plan



Silverdale Subarea Plan

VISION FOR SILVERDALE SUBAREA

Land Use

Within the Urban Growth Area, Silverdale has a mix of residential development, commercial centers and light industrial areas that serve the housing and employment needs of the community. These areas are integrated with the natural amenities of the landscape including the striking views of mountains and water, and access to open space, maintaining Silverdale's high quality of life. Community gathering places including meeting spaces and connecting sidewalks, which provide local shopping, services and opportunities for recreation, are interspersed throughout the area and are connected through pedestrian-friendly trail and path systems. Through the application of urban design guidelines, the unique characteristics of existing districts are preserved and identities for new development are fostered.

Economic Development

Our status as a regional retail and service center is complemented by the expansion and diversification of our economic base, particularly through expansion of businesses, as well as through development of educational opportunities.

Transportation

We have a transportation system that will properly support community and residential needs. We have a multimodal circulation system; it accommodates transit, bicycles, pedestrians, and autos. There are many options for getting into, out of, and moving within the urban growth area and bypassing the urban core. Downtown circulation is improved, we have a walkable environment and multimodal connectivity is increased through new roads, pathways, and through-block connections.

Housing

Our community provides a wide choice of housing types and prices -- accommodating a diversity of lifestyles and incomes. New residential development is centered in mixed income neighborhoods that are safe and secure. Each neighborhood has a character of its own and includes a mix of uses that provide opportunities for localized services and recreation close to home. We respect existing neighborhoods; their character is key to the long-term sustainability.

Governance

Within the 20-year planning horizon, Silverdale may be a self-governing city.

Social Capital

We have diverse opportunities for arts, recreation, entertainment, leisure activities and culture; activities we can "do" are continuously being created.

Capital Facilities

We have the public facilities to support a vibrant and growing city.

Natural Environment

We have tremendous natural resources and amenities. We are sensitive to our existing natural systems—maintaining, protecting, and conserving them in a way that is sensitive to their environmental functions, particularly Dyes Inlet watersheds and water quality and aquifer recharge areas. We are rich in significant, pristine resource areas.



Silverdale Subarea Plan Goals and Policies

LAND USE

Silverdale Goal 1. Land use mix

Provide sufficient capacity within the Urban Growth Area to properly accommodate a mix of residential, commercial, and industrial development to meet the extended population and employment projections for Silverdale.

Silverdale Policy 1.1 Monitor land supply over time to ensure a continued adequate supply of residential, commercial, and industrial designated land to meet Silverdale’s population and employment targets and to meet the needs of unexpected growth.

Silverdale Policy 1.2. In establishing and modifying land use designations, provide for a balanced and complete community.

Silverdale Policy 1.3. Incorporate reasonable measures that are appropriate to the Silverdale area to help focus growth in the urban growth area. These measures could be incentives, standards, policies, and/or regulations. In this Sub-Area Plan, incorporated reasonable measures include:

- Inclusion of economic development goals and policies that encourage employment and related housing/population growth in the Urban Growth Area;
- Support the Silverdale Regional Center goals and policies.

Silverdale Policy 1.4. In areas where pedestrian and/or bicycle activity is desired, such as in Old Town, areas of mixed-use development, and within residential neighborhoods, provide a balance of roads, sidewalks, bike lanes, separated paths, landscaping, crosswalks, and other new or creative solutions that provide safe and efficient ways to walk, bike, and roll.

Silverdale Policy 1.5. In areas where vehicular transportation will continue to be the predominant mode of travel, ensure that access to rights-of-way and site design standards provide for safe and convenient access by the traveling public.

Silverdale Goal 2. Recreation, arts and culture

Provide land availability for public and private community gathering places and diverse opportunities for arts, recreation, entertainment, leisure activities and culture.

Silverdale Policy 2.1 Support design standards that encourage provision of plazas, greens or other informal public meeting spaces with new development and redevelopment.



Silverdale Policy 2.2. Preserve and enhance the natural and aesthetic qualities of shoreline areas and riparian creek corridors while allowing reasonable development to meet the needs of property owners.

Silverdale Policy 2.3. Provide a park, recreation and open space system that enhances the quality of life for residents and visitors to the Silverdale community.

Silverdale Policy 2.4. Explore inclusion of a community center in the Silverdale Regional Center to meet the growing need for community spaces, particular for aging populations.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Silverdale Goal 3. Regional economy

Enhance the status of Silverdale as a regional retail and service center.

Silverdale Policy 3.1. Develop and implement an economic development program that encourages the location of businesses in the downtown core and actively seeks opportunities to strengthen the regional role of the retail and service center.

Silverdale Policy 3.2. Encourage the cooperation and collaboration of agencies and interested groups in marketing the Silverdale areas to attract new business.

Silverdale Policy 3.3. Encourage and support tourism activity and amenities as a significant contributor to the Silverdale economy.

Silverdale Goal 4. Economic base

Achieve diversification of Silverdale's economic base, particularly through expansion of businesses and higher educational opportunities.

Silverdale Policy 4.1. Facilitate the diversification and growth of the Silverdale area economic base through a range of appropriate commercial land use designations, adequate land supply, improved transportation infrastructure, active business recruitment, and business friendly policies and regulations.

Silverdale Policy 4.2. Actively recruit educational institutions to the Silverdale area.

Silverdale Policy 4.3. Identify and encourage business opportunities that may benefit from the geographic proximity of existing military facilities.

Silverdale Goal 5. Economic growth

Support and coordinate economic expansion through efficient use of land and provision of capital facilities.

Silverdale Policy 5.1. Encourage full use and development of designated commercial and industrial areas prior to expanding those areas. Promote revitalization within existing developed areas to take advantage of the investment in existing buildings and infrastructure.

Silverdale Policy 5.2. Provide incentives for re-use or redevelopment of existing commercial facilities in preference to building of new space.

Silverdale Policy 5.3. Provide adequate transportation infrastructure to serve a diverse range of commercial activity.

Silverdale Policy 5.4. Work to meet unique transportation needs of new or growing businesses.

Silverdale Policy 5.4. Support commercial development and redevelopment that complements and is compatible with the larger Silverdale community.

HOUSING

Silverdale Goal 7. Neighborhoods

Promote and protect the long-term viability, safety, character, and identity of existing neighborhoods.

Silverdale Policy 7.1. Identify opportunities for community services and general recreation facilities within or between residential neighborhoods, with strong emphasis on private development and maintenance by neighborhoods.

Silverdale Policy 7.2. Work with neighborhoods to identify key landmarks, boundaries, gathering places, significant natural features, existing and potential pedestrian routes, neighborhood gateways, and other features that help identify and establish their unique character.

TRANSPORTATION

Silverdale Goal 8. Transportation system

Develop and maintain a street and transportation system that effectively addresses the travel needs of the community and is consistent with the overall goals of the community.

Silverdale Policy 8.1. Develop and maintain performance standards, including operational level of service (LOS) standards for roadways and critical intersections within Silverdale.

Silverdale Policy 8.2. Continuously improve circulation to meet the needs of increased traffic and emergency access, while maintaining neighborhood quality and safety.



Silverdale Policy 8.3. Develop a circulation plan that meets the needs of increased traffic and emergency access throughout the Silverdale community while maintaining the importance of neighborhood quality and safety.

Silverdale Policy 8.4. Implement improvements identified in Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy (TIS), and update TIS as the infrastructure and land use changes (see Appendix D).

Silverdale Policy 8.5. Develop a plan of priorities and circulation for the effective movement of goods and services in the commercial districts and within residential neighborhoods, as appropriate.

Silverdale Policy 8.6. Develop an effective system of neighborhood traffic control to make local street safe for pedestrians, residents, and normal local traffic.

Silverdale Goal 9. Transit

Work with transit providers to develop programs, routes and schedules that better accommodate a larger number of users.

Silverdale Policy 9.1. Use public transit effectively in the Silverdale district and surrounding areas; especially the implementation of point-to-point shuttles and loop service, and service to high priority destinations.

Silverdale Policy 9.2. Consider location of Park-and-Ride lots or similar facilities when making land use designations.

Silverdale Policy 9.3. Develop priorities for Transportation Demand Management and Commute Trip Reduction, considering the work to home flow path for Silverdale workers.

Silverdale Goal 10. Non-motorized transportation

Improve safety and circulation for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Silverdale Policy 10.1. Complete sidewalk and bicycle lane projects identified in the Silverdale Transportation Improvement Strategy.

Silverdale Policy 10.2. Connect the Silverdale Regional Center to surrounding areas through pedestrian and non-motorized facilities.

Silverdale Policy 10.3. Implement multi-use pathway in Silverdale using a mix of off-street and on-street facilities, and connections to the trails system.

Silverdale Policy 10.4. Encourage public/private development of trails as well as public/private maintenance of trails.

Silverdale Goal 11. Multimodal transportation system

Develop and maintain an effective multimodal transportation system for Silverdale and the surrounding areas.

Silverdale Policy 11.1. Ensure that transportation facilities necessary for future growth are provided concurrent with growth and coordinated with the overall land use plan for Silverdale.

Silverdale Policy 11.2. Implement an effective transportation concurrency system that provides effective transportation infrastructure to support concurrent land use in growth and development.

Silverdale Policy 11.3. Establish connector roads' location and design through amendments to the Silverdale design standards, regional center subarea plan, or Kitsap County Code. Such amendments shall allow for flexibility if property ownership is consolidated and an alternate location and/or design will meet the intent of the connector road system.

Silverdale Policy 11.4. The connector roads shall be funded by private property owners or new development. Funding of these roadways may include, but is not limited to, County Road Improvement Districts (CRID) and individual developer construction. If public funding is available for the development of this roadway network, monies and project scope should be identified in the 6-year Transportation Improvement Plan.

Silverdale Goal 12. Greaves Way

Locate, design and construct transportation connections to Greaves Way that facilitate coordinated access to commercial, business center and industrial zoned lands.

Silverdale Policy 12.1. Locate and develop connector roads for Greaves Way that provide access to surrounding properties. Coordinate with property owners on alignment alternatives and roadway design.

Silverdale Policy 12.2. To maximize the use of Greaves Way, connector roads shall be delineated to provide free-flowing, multi-modal access to the commercial, industrial, and business properties in the area.

Silverdale Policy 12.3. Create a bus turn around on Greaves Way to improve transit access to a growing mixed-use center.

Silverdale Policy 12.4. Identify key pedestrian trails and greenways needed to link destinations in Silverdale.

Silverdale Policy 12.5. Ensure that stormwater facilities provide adequate drainage and minimize flooding while protecting and enhancing the water quality and habitat value of streams, wetlands, lakes, and Dyes Inlet.



Silverdale Goal 13. Solid waste and recycling

Provide efficient and convenient solid waste and recycling services to the Silverdale community through effective coordination with service providers.

Silverdale Policy 13.1. Coordinate with private solid waste collection services to ensure adequate service capacity for planned growth.

Silverdale Policy 13.2. Encourage programs for yard and food waste composting, waste recycling, and reuse of building materials.



SUQUAMISH, WA

CHAPTER 14

Suquamish Subarea Plan



Suquamish Subarea Plan

VISION FOR SUQUAMISH

Suquamish is a rural, historic waterfront community on the Port Madison Indian Reservation, which is defined by strong natural borders in northeast Kitsap County. The Port Madison Indian Reservation is located on the western and northern shore of Port Madison Bay. The reservation also fronts Agate Pass on the western side. Bainbridge Island is located on the eastern side of the Pass. The Agate Pass Bridge connects Bainbridge Island with the Reservation on the Kitsap Peninsula.


Increased growth pressures are threatening the Suquamish Village's natural boundaries. Increased development was beginning to exceed the capacities of the infrastructure systems. Transportation infrastructure and drainage systems were no longer adequate, open space diminished, and the rural character of the town changed. Tribal members living in Suquamish and non-Indian residents who moved to Suquamish for its rural qualities and remote location found their chosen lifestyle at risk. The area was designated a Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) to begin to address these conditions.

Any vision for Suquamish must balance the preservation of the rights of Tribal members and of non-Indian property owners to enjoy the reasonable use of their land. The Suquamish Village will make its visitors feel welcome, but not rely solely on tourism as a mechanism for economic health. Economic and cultural diversity shall be celebrated and enhanced for the benefit of all residents of Suquamish. The Suquamish Village's Native American history and presence shall be enhanced and remain a visible part of the Suquamish experience.

The downtown should remain the heart of Suquamish where residents and visitors will gather together to celebrate traditions and experience daily living. Suquamish will offer small business districts for small-scale neighborhood convenience stores or public services.

It shall become a community where development and facilities are focused on limiting impacts to climate and benefiting the environment. The community can enjoy its open spaces and recreational opportunities as well as safe and pleasurable walks, which link the neighborhoods to each other and to the commercial districts. The Suquamish Rural Village shall welcome all social and economic groups. It shall provide a sense of community, and the Tribe and the County shall work cooperatively.

Figure 45. Suquamish LAMIRD Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative



Suquamish Goals, Policies, and Strategies

LAND USE

Suquamish Goal 1.

Ensure development is consistent with the Suquamish Village Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD) designation and Growth Management Act requirements.

Suquamish Policy 1.1. Maintain development regulations for each Suquamish residential and commercial zoning consistent with historic conditions.

Suquamish Policy 1.2. Maintain existing code regarding legacy and nonconforming lots.

Suquamish Policy 1.3. Expand commercial opportunities for small service businesses catering to residents and tourists (e.g., coffee shop and meeting spaces).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Suquamish Goal 2.

Establish a Kitsap Regional Library extension.

Suquamish Policy 2.1. Explore prospective locations for a Kitsap Regional Library (KLR) extension in coordination with KRL, Kitsap County, and the Suquamish Tribe to establish a library with suitable amenities (Wi-Fi, computer access, and other access).

Suquamish Goal 3.

Provide Transportation improvements that enhance economic development.

Suquamish Policy 3.1. Conduct studies to maximize the effectiveness of Suquamish downtown parking, traffic, land use and potential aesthetics.

Suquamish Goal 4.

Establish a Suquamish aesthetic beneficial to economic development.

Suquamish Policy 4.1. Determine what a Suquamish downtown (Augusta Avenue and Suquamish Way) aesthetic would look like (signage, streetlights, storefronts, public art, etc.) and further define action required to achieve that aesthetic to include:

- Signage to meet the Suquamish aesthetic, including welcoming sign and street signs.

- Implement utility improvements, including street lighting that would support economic development.
- Examine the feasibility and implement appropriate trash can placement (and supporting solid waste removal).

Suquamish Policy 4.2. Collaborate with Suquamish Tribal Government, Port Madison Enterprises, and other business district interests to examine and support zoning and construction encouraging first floor storefronts with affordable second floor living options.

Suquamish Goal 5.

Support information sharing and information access in Suquamish.

Suquamish Policy 5.1. Examine, and if feasible implement, a Public Wi-Fi access capability.

Suquamish Policy 5.2. Work with providers and Kitsap Public Utilities District to expand broadband and upgraded cellular service within the Village.

HOUSING

Suquamish Goal 6

Limit future growth within the Suquamish Village while allowing greater housing diversity to serve multiple income levels.

Suquamish Policy 6.1. Encourage housing types beyond single-family, detached to increase affordability.

Suquamish Strategy 6.a. Allow accessory dwelling units to be permitted uses in Suquamish residential zones.

TRANSPORTATION

Suquamish Goal 7.

Evaluate changes for Augusta and Suquamish Way to allow for safe and effective access to businesses.

Suquamish Policy 7.1. Examine, and if feasible implement, a three-lane corridor along Augusta Avenue starting at NE Geneva Street and continuing up Suquamish Way to Division [in vicinity of the Suquamish Village] to enhance current and future Suquamish economic development and access.

Suquamish Goal 8.



Improve parking to support safe business access.

Suquamish Policy 8.1. Improve parking along, or in vicinity of, Augusta Avenue starting at NE Geneva Street and continuing up Suquamish Way to Division to enhance current and future Suquamish economic development and access.

Suquamish Policy 8.2. Assess opportunities on private or public property to allow safe loading and unloading of goods within the business district.

Suquamish Goal 9.

Develop walkways, crosswalks and bicycle routes that enhance the walkability, safety, and economic development of Suquamish.

Suquamish Policy 9.1. Provide walkways and crosswalks extending on Augusta Avenue from NE Geneva Street to Suquamish Way to enhance current and future Suquamish economic development and access.

Suquamish Policy 9.2. Examine, and if feasible implement, walkways and crosswalks on Division Ave NE and NE McKinstry St. (starting at Suquamish Way) to provide a safe and walkable access to the Sports Court Park and the historically significant Old Man House Park.

Suquamish Policy 9.3. Provide a pedestrian connection between Suquamish and the network of trails within the Cowling Creek Preserve, which with additional development could serve as a bike route bypassing a portion of Miller Bay Road with no shoulders.

Suquamish Policy 9.4. Examine, and if feasible implement, paving the shoulders of Miller Bay Road from NE Geneva St. to Gunderson Rd. thereby providing the first/only safe route for walkers, joggers, or bicyclists to enter and depart Suquamish to the north towards Kingston.

Suquamish Strategy 9.a. Expand crosswalks and walkways on Division, Augusta, and Brockton to enhance pedestrian safety.

Suquamish Strategy 9.b. Expand shoulders along arterials leading into and out of the Suquamish Village (e.g., Miller Bay Road, NE Columbia Street and Suquamish Way) provide a safe route for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Suquamish Goal 10.

Evaluate road safety improvements in and around Suquamish.

Suquamish Policy 10.1. Examine, and if feasible implement, speed controls and widening/paved shoulders on NE Columbia Street to increase safety as the alternate northern route out of Suquamish.

Suquamish Policy 10.2. Examine, and if feasible, due to existing zoning and road width constraints, implement one-way traffic options on Geneva and Center Streets.

Suquamish Strategy 10.a. Explore traffic calming opportunities (e.g., traffic speed tables) to arterials and collectors including Augusta, Division, and Columbia.

Suquamish Strategy 10.b. Expand street lighting where necessary for public safety (e.g., bus stops and key intersections).

Suquamish Strategy 10.c. Encourage expanded transit service between the Suquamish Park and Ride and Kingston, Poulsbo, and Bainbridge Island.

PARKS AND OPEN SPACE

Suquamish Goal 11.

Coordinate efforts among the community, the Suquamish Tribe, and the County to maintain existing Parks within and surrounding Suquamish to their fullest potential.

Suquamish Policy 11.1. Where consistent with CFP resurface the Sport Court at NE Division Ave and McKinstry St. for increased safety and use.

Suquamish Policy 11.2. Enhance access and kayak launches at appropriate County rights of way throughout Suquamish (i.e., Hemphill Rd. terminus, or southwest terminus/right of way NE Angeline Rd.)

Suquamish Policy 11.3. Expand park maintenance.

Suquamish Policy 11.4. Examine and if feasible implement watering capability to Angeline Park and the Sports Park for maintenance of the plant beds.

Suquamish Policy 11.5. Implement upgrades and improvements to the Angeline Park playground.

Suquamish Strategy 11.a. Examine and if feasible implement watering capability to Angeline Park and the Sports Park for maintenance of the plant beds.

Suquamish Strategy 11.b. Enhance public access to County road ends at James and Hemphill through improved trails informed by the requirements of the Shoreline Management Program.

Suquamish Strategy 11.c. Explore trail connections between the Suquamish Village and Cowling Creek Preserve.

Suquamish Goal 12.

Partner with the Suquamish Tribe to discover new opportunities for desired Parks and Open Spaces.



Suquamish Policy 12.1. Explore, and if feasible develop, an off-leash dog park.

Suquamish Policy 12.2. Explore, and if feasible develop, a skateboard park.

Suquamish Policy 12.3. Explore, and if feasible develop, a community garden.

Suquamish Strategy 12.a. Explore transfer of the Sports Court and Angeline Park to the Suquamish Tribe to increase maintenance and continue access for the general public.

Suquamish Goal 13.

Expand access to public restrooms.

Suquamish Policy 13.1. Collaborate with Suquamish Tribal Government to expand public restroom within the Suquamish Village commercial and public areas.

Suquamish Strategy 13.a. Collaborate with Suquamish Tribal Government to establish public restrooms near the Suquamish Dock.

CAPITAL FACILITIES

Suquamish Goal 14.

Expand and improve Suquamish stormwater and sewer facilities.

Suquamish Policy 14.1. Support development of a comprehensive and natural approach to stormwater management to implement projects to control flows, reduce flooding, and enhance water quality.

Suquamish Strategy 14.a. Complete the stormwater treatment projects including the Harris and Angeline Avenue area.



GORST, WA

CHAPTER 15

Gorst Subarea Plan



Gorst Neighborhood Plan

VISION FOR GORST


The Gorst community is located on Sinclair Inlet between Bremerton and Port Orchard. Its strategic location is reflected as a vital transportation link as two highways, SR 3 and SR 16, intersect at Gorst. As an important crossroads a railroad also traverses Gorst connecting the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard with the Bangor submarine facility and the Port of Shelton.

In the coming years Gorst will continue to play an important role for county residents, commuters, and military personnel who travel to via the area major job centers in the County including Downtown Bremerton and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, Bremerton National Airport and associated Puget Sound Industrial Center and others.

In 2022 WSDOT noted that from the north at Navy Yard City, State Route 3 carries 54,000 Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT), increasing to 83,000 AADT north of Gorst, and continuing on SR 16 to Port Orchard with 51,000 AADT. Resolution of the decades-long, transportation congestion issues in the Gorst area are a key priority to improve Kitsap's economy and protect national security. In addition to being strategically located between major population and job centers in Kitsap County, the Gorst area contains regionally significant environmental resources. The approximately 6,570-acre Gorst Creek Watershed is diverse with thousands of acres of intact forest land, miles of streams and acres of wetlands. Much of the forested area that comprises the north and central portion of the Gorst Creek Watershed is publicly owned and lies within a contiguous area that also contains Green Mountain and Tahuya State Forest. Taken together, this area comprises the largest open-space block in the Puget Trough Ecoregion of the Puget Sound Basin. The estuary (Sinclair Inlet) supports shellfish, waterfowl, shorebirds, great blue herons, and bald eagles. The Gorst Creek estuary is a major passageway and nursery for Puget Sound Chinook, Coho, and Chum salmon, along with Steelhead, and Sea-Run Cutthroat trout. Gorst Creek supports a fish rearing facility managed by the Suquamish Tribe and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife.

Gorst's vision is one of careful balance; managing its valuable role as a transportation lynchpin for Kitsap County along with responsible stewardship for its significant natural environment.

Figure 46. Gorst UGA Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative



Gorst Goals, Policies, and Strategies

LAND USE, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNITY DESIGN

Goal 1.

Create opportunities for well-designed, sustainable commercial and residential growth and development.

Gorst Policy 1.1. Encourage regional and local serving commercial uses that meet community shopping needs, provide jobs, and enhance the image of Gorst through improved landscaping and site design.

Gorst Policy 1.2. Through the land use plan and zoning, allow opportunities for single family units, townhouses, and flats to provide a range of housing choices in Gorst.

Gorst Policy 1.3. Allow horizontal and vertical mixed-use development to offer greater business and housing choices and live-work arrangements.

Gorst Policy 1.4. Ensure zoning and design standards promote development patterns that increase open space and recreation opportunities, reduce impervious areas, and cluster in the least sensitive areas of a property.

Gorst Policy 1.5. Apply streetscape, landscape, building, and site design standards for new development to promote shoreline views, allow for development compatibility, enhance property values, and reinforce Gorst as the southern gateway to Bremerton.

Gorst Policy 1.6. Allocate population to the Gorst UGA based on the Gorst Subarea Plan. Ensure allocations are also consistent with Countywide Planning Policies. Until such time as population is available for allocation to Gorst to support mine site redevelopment following reclamation, the mineral resource overlay will continue.

ENVIRONMENT

Gorst Goal 2.

Protect and restore fish and wildlife habitat along Gorst Creek and Sinclair Inlet.

Gorst Policy 2.1. Develop a comprehensive program to restore the Gorst Creek Corridor in the UGA.

Gorst Policy 2.2. Promote shoreline and habitat restoration along Sinclair Inlet.

Gorst Policy 2.3. Coordinate County and City shoreline regulations and restoration plans along Gorst Creek and Sinclair Inlet to provide adequate protection and incorporate best management practices based on the Watershed Characterization Study.

Gorst Strategy 2.a. Upon annexation, the City shall apply its Shoreline Master Program to Sinclair Inlet and Gorst Creek. In addition, the City shall apply a Gorst Creek Management Zone Overlay recognizing the habitat requirements of listed fish species, the current degraded buffer conditions, and tailored approaches to implement best management practices and incentives for restoration.

Gorst Strategy 2.b. Prior to annexation, Kitsap County may consider City marine shoreline buffers and the Gorst Creek Management Zone Overlay as a means to mitigate negative impacts when reviewing site specific land use applications, such as variances.

Gorst Goal 3.

Improve water quality and reduce flooding in the Gorst UGA.

Gorst Policy 3.1. Require enhanced water quality consistent with the Sinclair Inlet Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDL) (USEPA 2012) throughout the watershed and UGA. Reduction of impervious surfaces and onsite treatment of stormwater should be required in accordance with best management practices specified in the 2019 Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington (Ecology 2019), or its equivalent or successor, with a preference for infiltration to reduce fecal coliform.

Gorst Policy 3.2. Reduce erosion and sediment export through measures such as adequate stream buffers, setbacks, reduced overland flow through infiltration and vegetation cover. Discussion: See the discussion under Policy UGA-3 regarding coordinated regulations.

Gorst Policy 3.3. Provide incentives and regulations that reduce impervious surfaces, promote natural and distributed stormwater techniques, and incorporate native and naturalized vegetation.

Gorst Policy 3.4. Wherever practicable, require low impact development measures such as infiltration for new development and redevelopment. Where impractical, stormwater detention may be allowed.

Gorst Policy 3.5. Incorporate low impact development best management practices into new development and redevelopment to mitigate and reduce flood impacts.

Gorst Policy 3.6. Reduce flood hazards through infrastructure improvements and stormwater management.



Gorst Policy 3.7. Policy UGA-10. Allow zero direct and untreated discharge to streams and marine water bodies in association with development and redevelopment. Apply vegetation management, clearing and grading, and stormwater rules that minimize erosion and protect water quality and habitat.

Gorst Policy 3.8. Implement adaptations to address potential effects of sea level rise on Sinclair Inlet properties. These may include, but are not limited to, accounting for sea level rise in the design of buildings and impervious areas, as well as roadway, flood management, and utility facilities.

TRANSPORTATION, PUBLIC SERVICES & UTILITIES

Gorst Goal 4.

Provide effective, efficient, and quality capital facilities and public services at the level necessary to meet the Gorst community needs and support allowed growth.

Gorst Policy 4.1. Work with federal, state, and local agencies to implement transportation improvements to manage congestion.

Gorst Policy 4.2. Improve safety and circulation, and improve transportation mode choices including transit, bicycle, pedestrian, and automobiles.

Gorst Policy 4.3. Encourage improved Kitsap Transit service such as added park and ride facilities.

Gorst Policy 4.4. Design roads to incorporate gateway treatments, boulevard style streetscape improvements, and access improvements to invite the community to Gorst and allow convenient travel to regional businesses.

Gorst Policy 4.5. Encourage public access to the shoreline along Sinclair Inlet and portions of Gorst Creek.

Gorst Policy 4.6. Require new development to meet Bremerton standards for water and wastewater.

Gorst Policy 4.7. Ensure new developments that create a demand for parks and recreation provide such facilities onsite or contribute their fair share to provision of offsite facilities.

Gorst Policy 4.8. Facilitate adequate fire and emergency response in the UGA through application of uniform fire and building codes, emergency access standards, roadway congestion management measures, and mutual aid agreements.

Gorst Policy 4.9. Ensure adequate police services are provided within the UGA to meet Kitsap County Sheriff and Bremerton police department response time and case load objectives.

Gorst Policy 4.10. Promote crime prevention through environmental design techniques to new development.

Gorst Policy 4.11. Provide long-range growth assumptions and new development applications to South Kitsap School District to ensure educational services can meet needs of new residents.

Gorst Goal 5.

Prioritize the Gorst interchange in transportation funding advocacy.

Gorst Policy 5.1. Coordinate with the Cities of Bremerton and Port Orchard, the Port of Bremerton, the Department of Defense, WSDOT and state and federal legislators on developing and executing designs to expand SR3 and SR 16 in the Gorst area.

Gorst Policy 5.2. Lead discussions of funding opportunities to address the Gorst transportation issues in a holistic yet phased approach.

ANNEXATION

Gorst Goal 6.

Facilitate a seamless transition of services from Kitsap County governance to City of Bremerton governance when properties become annexed to the City.

Gorst Policy 6.1. Explore all methods for annexation with the Gorst residents within the planning horizon. Consider annexation of the Gorst UGA to the City in the near term.

Gorst Policy 6.2. Prior to and following annexation, implement the Gorst Subarea Capital Facility Plan. Levels of service should be implemented concurrent with new development.





ILLAHEE STATE PARK, WA

CHAPTER 16

Illahee Neighborhood Plan

Illahee Neighborhood Plan


VISION FOR ILLAHEE

The Illahee Community Plan is a statement reflecting the civic pride and community involvement that has existed for more than 120 years. The community shares a proud sense of accomplishment in many environmental and community projects. More importantly, many residents share a real concern for the future of Illahee if they and their neighbors are not actively and materially involved in the planning process. Many of the local residents recognize that what originally attracted them to this area and what keeps them here is now threatened. This vision allows them to continue to make improvements to further enhance the atmosphere and character of the area, ensuring that it remains the unique community they know and love. When posed with the question, “What would you like to see addressed in a community plan?” residents envisioned a community centered around and amongst the abundance of natural resources in the area, which include Illahee State Park, Illahee Creek, and the Illahee Preserve; three miles of pristine waterfront; two major docks; and much more.

Residents want to maintain the community charm and quaintness that Illahee currently offers. Residents wish to protect the unique quality of the natural environment, park areas, wetlands, streams, and wildlife habitat. Residents also recognize the need to sustain the community connectedness and to accommodate reasonable growth in the area. These visions and dreams can be accomplished by permitting growth in those areas where infrastructure enhancements already exist and environmental protections are ensured. This also means securing open space designations for the natural resources that need protection and, especially, those already specified as park or preserve. It is this mix of land uses that makes the Illahee area a unique blend of natural resources and open space surrounded by semi-rural areas, urban areas, and a short perimeter of a commercial business strip along State Highway 303. Illahee is an area blessed with a diversity of natural and man-made resources. Residents desire a community plan that blends the best of these worlds into a place where they can continue to live in harmony with nature and their fellow residents.



Figure 47. Illahee Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative



LAND USE

Illahee Goal 1.

Formalize a communication process between Kitsap County and Illahee Community Groups.

Illahee Policy 1.1. Notify Illahee community groups that request notice of proposed land use actions and zoning changes within Illahee.

Illahee Policy 1.2. Support the continuation of an Illahee Community Citizens Advisory Group (CAG) to represent the residents of Illahee in furthering the Plan's goals and policies.

ENVIRONMENT

Illahee Goal 2.

Maintain current zoning that allows for protection of the environment.

Illahee Policy 2.1. Maintain the Greenbelt (GB) zone with its environmentally sensitive densities and development standards.

Illahee Goal 3.

Protect Illahee's existing views of Mount Rainier, the Cascade Mountain Range, Bainbridge Island, Puget Sound, and the Seattle Skyline.

Illahee Policy 3.1. Utilize the View Protection Overlay Zone for the Illahee community.

Illahee Goal 4.

Promote safety and improve views by using underground utilities where applicable.

Illahee Policy 4.1. Support the coordination of burying utilities during the planning phases of new road works in locations where views are obstructed or safety is compromised by utilities.

Illahee Goal 5.

Protect and restore the riparian areas of Illahee Creek and its estuary.

Illahee Policy 5.1. Use infiltration as a method of stormwater, flow control, within the Illahee Creek Aquifer Recharge Area.

Illahee Policy 5.2. Evaluate solutions outside of using culverts for Illahee Creek that allow for the natural meandering of the creek and maintains/restores the accretion delta floodplain.



Illahee Policy 5.3. Coordinate the restoration of floodplain habitat and estuary function at the mouth of Illahee Creek.

Illahee Goal 6.

Enhance efforts to protect the biological diversity and habitats of fish, birds, wildlife, and plant life within the Illahee community.

Illahee Policy 6.1. Continue to identify and map wetland areas within Illahee as funding allows.

Illahee Goal 7.

Conserve the scenery and natural and historic trees within the Illahee community.

Illahee Policy 7.1. Maintain minimum 25-foot natural vegetative buffers between development and roadways, wherever possible.

Illahee Goal 8.

Continue efforts to preserve open space, wildlife corridors, habitat, stream health, and recreation opportunities, and support the implementation of the Illahee Forest Preserve Stewardship Plan.

Illahee Policy 8.1. Support the pursuit of grant monies to complete purchases or conservation easements within the Illahee Creek corridor as outlined in the Illahee Preserve Stewardship Plan, including target properties in the Illahee Creek Watershed, and the “Heart of the Park” properties.

Illahee Policy 8.2. Support the pursuit of grant monies for the conservation of the undeveloped properties along Illahee Road between Illahee Creek and Trenton Ave. which are coincident with the Illahee Greenbelt, Wildlife Corridor, Mosquito Fleet Trail Scenic Byway, and proposed multimodal regional trail.

TRANSPORTATION

Illahee Goal 9.

Address Illahee’s pedestrian thoroughfares to provide safe multimodal transportation options in and out of the community.

Illahee Policy 9.1. Examine, and if feasible, create a safe multimodal transportation option for Illahee Road.

Illahee Policy 9.2. Examine, and if feasible, create a safe multimodal transportation option along Oceanview Blvd/East Blvd and McWilliams from Illahee Road to SR 303.

Illahee Policy 9.3. Examine, and if feasible, install a round-about at the oblique 3-way intersection of Illahee Road, Oceanview Blvd, and Allview Blvd.

Illahee Goal 10.

Support the hydrological studies of well systems around Illahee Creek to determine the appropriate boundaries around the creek to ensure base flow levels in the creek are maintained.

Illahee Policy 10.1. Support State agencies to begin a water balance monitoring system comparing base flows in Illahee Creek with draw down rates of local wells.

Illahee Goal 11.

Support the redevelopment of the intersection of Illahee road, Oceanview Boulevard, and the Illahee Community Dock into a community focal point.

Illahee Policy 11.1. Facilitate the planning and construction of a community center at this location, which may also support a business.

Illahee Policy 11.2. Facilitate the planning and construction of a marine park at this location.





KEYPORT, WA

CHAPTER 16

Keyport Neighborhood Plan

Keyport Neighborhood Plan

VISION FOR KEYPORT

Keyport is a rural, historic waterfront village bounded and limited in size by its natural borders of water and the Naval Undersea Warfare Center. The community consists primarily of single-family homes, a few small businesses, and a community park system. The community is close-knit, where people know and greet their neighbors, and has an active community club which provides social events. The Keyport community wants to limit urban growth to retain its sense of community and small-town ambience. Keyport residents would prefer that future business expansion would be limited to small businesses and services serving the community, consistent with historical usage located near the downtown core.


The Keyport community desires to reestablish certain historic commercial zoning and to establish appropriate land use zoning to maintain historic rural character where it is consistent with historical public services. The community would like to establish development patterns, including lot sizes, which may encourage infill development consistent with the Growth Management Act.

These infill development patterns would be consistent with historical progressive development yet limit urban-like sprawl and high-density growth. The Keyport community would like to improve existing transportation infrastructure and services to make it easier and safer to get around the community, make the community more pedestrian friendly, and improve parking for visitors. Improvements would be requested from Kitsap County as feasible to improve public infrastructure and facilities, including expansion of the sewer lines, upgrading the storm water drainage system, improving street lighting, and improving marine access.

The community would like to retain a flexible community park system attractive as gathering and recreational centers for both children and adults. Keyport residents would like to preserve and enhance the small-town atmosphere and visual character of the area for the community as well as visitors, where one can enjoy a safe and pleasurable walk, enjoy the spectacular marine and mountain views, and have easy access to a village center that acts as a social center with restaurants and services providing for basic needs.



Figure 48. Keyport Zoning Map, Board Directed Preferred Alternative



LAND USE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Keyport Goal 1.

Protect and enhance the Keyport Village character.

Keyport Policy 1.1. Promote architecture and site amenities consistent with the historic character of Keyport.

Keyport Goal 2.

Provide zoning that is consistent with Keyport's existing built environment and lot sizes that allow for beneficial infill development.

Keyport Policy 2.1. Set minimum lot sizes, setbacks, heights, and densities for residential development.

Keyport Policy 2.2. Require application of Design Standards for all new commercial development in Keyport.

Keyport Goal 3.

Encourage property owners to cluster newly subdivided lots.

Keyport Policy 3.1. Reevaluate the historical density bonus for all future clustered developments in the Keyport Village Low Residential (KVLR) zone.

Keyport Goal 4.

Promote the establishment and support of a vital Keyport Village Commercial zone.

Keyport Policy 4.1. Establish a commercial zone appropriate for the population and transportation network of the Keyport Village.

Keyport Policy 4.2. Promote businesses that further the economic vitality of Keyport as a "destination".

Keyport Goal 5.

Encourage mixed-use development within the commercial zone.

Keyport Policy 5.1. Modify County parking requirements to levels appropriate for the Keyport Village.



Keyport Policy 5.2. Encourage the development of design standards for the Keyport Village Commercial zone.

Keyport Policy 5.3. Allow increased height limits for structures within the Keyport Village Commercial zone.

Keyport Goal 6.

Protect Keyport's existing views of the Olympic mountain range, Liberty Bay, Dogfish Bay, and Puget Sound.

Keyport Policy 6.1. Encourage development that creates the least impact to existing views.

Keyport Goal 7.

Archaeological, cultural, and historic structures or places are an important community asset, are a part of Keyport's character, and should be identified, evaluated, and preserved.

Keyport Policy 7.1. The Keyport community, in conjunction with the Poulsbo historical society, should identify and seek funding to institute a historic survey, implement a local, historic registry program and/or the creation of a landmark commission.

Keyport Policy 7.2. If feasible, consider the implementation of a local historic preservation ordinance.

Keyport Goal 8.

Historic structures or places are an important feature of community design and should be preserved and enhanced.

Keyport Policy 8.1. Design Standards should be implemented for design of projects adjacent to a historic structure to ensure that new development is compatible with the structure and that its surroundings are preserved.

TRANSPORTATION AND PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS

Keyport Goal 9.

Encourage development of an efficient multimodal transportation system and develop a funding strategy and financing plan to meet its needs.

Keyport Policy 9.1. Future Washington State Route 308 Improvements should consider the use of separated, continuous, 5- foot paved bicycle / pathways for pedestrian use. These walkways shall be coordinated with the Mosquito Fleet Trail Plan as necessary.

Keyport Policy 9.2. Developments abutting County rights-of-way within the Keyport Village Commercial zone should include sidewalk construction.

Keyport Policy 9.3. Set minimum lot sizes, setbacks, heights, and densities for residential development.

Keyport Policy 9.4. Require application of Design Standards for all new commercial development in Keyport.

Keyport Goal 10.

Provide residents the opportunity to participate in the development of transportation planning policy.

Keyport Policy 10.1. Encourage Keyport resident participation, organizations, or individuals, in County and State transportation planning efforts within or adjacent to the Keyport Village.

Keyport Policy 10.2. Analyze accident data to determine where safety-related improvements are necessary. Prioritize and implement safety-related improvements during the transportation planning process.

Keyport Goal 11.

Minimize negative environmental impacts by the transportation system.

Keyport Policy 11.1. Maintain environmental standards and mitigation requirements that are the same or higher than those placed upon the private sector, especially adjacent to or upstream from salt-water marine environments.



PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Keyport Goal 12.

Encourage expansion of the existing sewer distribution system to all properties within the Keyport Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development boundary.

Keyport Policy 12.1. Encourage all new construction and remodel projects involving an increase in sewage beyond the existing capacity of the septic system to connect to sewer if within 200 feet of an existing line.

Keyport Policy 12.2. Immediately address failed septic systems.

Keyport Policy 12.3. Encourage property owners on shorelines or near other critical areas to connect to the sewer system.

Keyport Policy 12.4. Consider establishing a Local Improvement District for properties west of Sunset Avenue.

Keyport Goal 13.

Encourage enhanced Library Services in Keyport.

Keyport Policy 13.1. Work with Kitsap Regional Library to encourage regular service of the Kitsap Regional Library Bookmobile within Keyport.

PORT IMPROVEMENTS AND WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT

Keyport Goal 14.

Work with the Port of Keyport to encourage expansion of the existing Port of Keyport Facilities.

Keyport Policy 14.1. Work with the Port of Keyport to update the Port of Keyport Master Plan.

Keyport Policy 14.2. Work with the Port of Keyport to identify specific projects for a Port of Keyport funding measure.

Keyport Policy 14.3. Work with the Port of Keyport to research grant opportunities for shoreline improvement or replacement of marine facilities.

Keyport Goal 15.

Minimize additional private docks in Keyport.

Keyport Policy 15.1. Encourage joint use docks for any new dock development.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT AND PARKS AND RECREATION

Keyport Goal 16.

Protect, restore, and enhance the natural and shoreline resources that add to the unique character of the Keyport Village.

Keyport Policy 16.1. Encourage permanent preservation of lots with significant critical areas or wildlife habitat.

Keyport Policy 16.2. Work with the Kitsap Health District to monitor private septic systems and immediately respond to any failed system within Keyport that may flow into Dogfish Bay or Liberty Bay.

Keyport Policy 16.3. Encourage the replanting of native tree and plant species on all properties, especially those publicly held.

Keyport Policy 16.4. Encourage creation of natural greenways, vegetated pathways, backyard natural habitat corridors, and street plantings. Keyport Goal 18. Maintain current public facilities, parks, and port facilities, and add new facilities when determined by the community.

Keyport Policy 16.5. Coordinate with the Keyport Village community on any development plans for public facility improvements and additions.

Keyport Policy 16.6. Pursue creative funding strategies, grants, and opportunities to leverage federal, state, local, and volunteer sources for maintenance and capital improvement budgets.

Keyport Goal 17.

Provide facilities to serve the variety of ages and needs in the community.

Keyport Policy 17.1. Explore the planning and construction of a community center within the Keyport Village boundary.



ARTS AND CULTURE

Keyport Goal 18.

Encourage local support for a creative and economic environment that allows artists to continue to live and work in and for the community.

Keyport Policy 18.1. Create a stimulating visual environment through public and private artworks programs and create a greater understanding and appreciation of art and artists through community dialogue, education, and involvement.

Keyport Policy 18.2. Advocate for the inclusion of quality public art in projects built by both private developers and public agencies, promote quality design in both the natural and built environments and use artists on design teams.

Keyport Goal 19.

Preserve and share the community's unique setting, character, history, arts, and culture by developing partnerships, resources and attractions that respect the needs and desires of Keyport residents.

Keyport Policy 19.1. Identify and record Keyport's "Sense of Place" through a continuous public dialogue about the influence of the arts, history, and culture.

Keyport Policy 19.2. Use artistic, historic, and cultural events as vehicles for sharing Keyport's uniqueness with residents and visitors while cultivating partnerships among the local artists, organizations and those interested in the arts, economic development, tourism, and historic preservation.

Keyport Policy 19.3. Identify local artists and publicize their value to the community through opportunities for public dialogue, and online database, and directory of artists, and residency programs, with support through non-profit organizations.

SUSTAINABILITY

Keyport Goal 20.

Encourage sustainable practices and green building in Keyport.

Keyport Policy 20.1. Implement Low Impact Develop Standards for Keyport Stormwater development and improvements.

Keyport Policy 20.2. Promote Solar, Wind, Tidal, Wave Generation and other renewable energy generation infrastructure to serve the Keyport Community.

Keyport Policy 20.3. Promote installation of energy efficient fixtures (both electric and water based).

Keyport Policy 20.4. Promote U.S. Green Building Council's; Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) silver certification standards for all future public buildings in Keyport.

COMMUNITY BUILDING AND PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

Keyport Goal 21.

Foster an environment that supports the active and meaningful involvement of the community in local, County-wide, and regional issues.

Keyport Policy 21.1. Ensure that Keyport residents have access in the community to information regarding future land uses and activities.

Keyport Policy 21.2. Encourage the support and maintenance of the Keyport Improvement Group to represent the residents of Keyport in furthering of the Plan's goals and policies.



Appendix A. Housing Element Technical Analysis




FINAL REPORT

HOUSING ELEMENT TECHNICAL ANALYSIS KITSAP COUNTY

JULY 8, 2024

Prepared for: Kitsap County
Department of Community
Development

Eric Baker
Deputy County Administrator
614 Division Street MS-7
Port Orchard, WA 98366



Title-page image: Poulsbo waterfront. Photo by Facet.



The information contained in this report is based on the application of technical guidelines currently accepted as the best available science and in conjunction with the manuals and criteria outlined in the methods section. All discussions, conclusions and recommendations reflect the best professional judgment of the author(s) and are based upon information available at the time the study was conducted. All work was completed within the constraints of budget, scope, and timing. The findings of this report are subject to verification and agreement by the appropriate local, state and federal regulatory authorities. No other warranty, expressed or implied, is made.

Facet Reference Number: 2112.0230.00

Facet Contact: Matt Covert
Senior Planner

Table of Contents

1 Introduction..... 1

 1.1 Housing Element Requirements.....1

 1.2 Development of Housing Allocations..... 2

2 Land Capacity Analysis 3

 2.1 Alternatives Summary3

 2.2 Step 1: Summarize land capacity for housing production by zone 5

 2.3 Additional capacity for ADUs on developed lots..... 5

3 Classify zones by allowed housing types and density levels 6

 3.1 Categories for classifying zones by housing types allowed6

 3.2 Classifying land use zones using zone categories 6

 3.4 Relate zone categories to potential income levels served..... 9

4 Summarize Capacity by Zone Category 10

 4.1 Alternative 1..... 11

 4.2 Alternative 2..... 12

 4.3 Alternative 3..... 13

 4.4 Preferred Alternative 14

5 Compare projected housing needs to capacity 15

 5.1 Alternative 1..... 15

 5.2 Alternative 2..... 16

 5.3 Alternative 3..... 16

 5.4 Preferred Alternative 17

6 Evaluating capacity for emergency housing needs..... 18

7 Adequate Provisions Documentation..... 19

 7.1 Housing units needed to manage both current and projected housing needs,
 broken down by income bracket..... 19

 7.2 Documenting programs and actions needed to achieve housing availability 20

 7.2.1 Review housing production trends to determine if barriers exist 20

 7.3 Gather information to determine what kind(s) of barriers exist 22

 7.3.1 Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist..... 22

 7.3.2 Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist..... 26

 7.3.3 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and emergency housing..... 30

 7.3.4 Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) barrier review checklist..... 32

 7.4 Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps..... 34



List of Tables

Table 1. Kitsap County Draft Comprehensive Plan Table 1.9 (p. 82)	2
Table 2. Land Capacity Analysis Summary by Zone in the Preferred Alternative. Source: Kitsap County, May 2024	5
Table 3. Zone Categories and Housing Types Allowed	6
Table 4. Classification of Zone Categories using County Zones.....	8
Table 5. Zone Categories Analysis for Affordability Levels	9
Table 6. Multipliers for Varying Housing Types in Urban Low Zone, by UGA and Alternative	10
Table 7. Alternative 1 Capacity by Zone Category.....	11
Table 8. Alternative 2 Capacity by Zone Category.....	12
Table 9. Alternative 3 Capacity by Zone Category.....	13
Table 10. Preferred Alternative Capacity by Zone Category.....	14
Table 11. Projected Need vs. Capacity, Alternative 1	16
Table 12. Projected Need vs. Capacity, Alternative 2	16
Table 13. Projected Need vs. Capacity, Alternative 3	17
Table 14. Projected Need vs Capacity, Preferred Alternative	18
Table 15. Review of Housing Unit Need by Income Level	19
Table 16. Residential Building Permits in Unincorporated Kitsap County, 2013-2019 (2021 Buildable Lands Report, DCG/Watershed analysis).....	20
Table 17. Comparison of production trends to housing needs to determine if barriers exist.....	21
Table 18. Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist.....	26
Table 19. Low- to Mid-Rise Multifamily housing barrier review checklist	30
Table 20. PSH and Emergency Housing barrier review checklist	32
Table 21. ADU barrier review checklist.....	34
Table 22. Local tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps.....	35

1. Introduction

The draft Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Periodic Update was released for public comment on December 15, 2023, with a comment period running through April 8, 2024. While the draft contained full sets of proposed goals and policies for each element, some elements need additional technical analysis in order to comply with Department of Commerce (Commerce) requirements for comprehensive plan periodic updates under the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Comprehensive plans are required to comply with the procedural and substantive requirements of RCW 36.70A. Substantively, the elements of the comprehensive plan must comply with RCW 36.70A.070 (and .080 for optional elements). HB 1220, which was signed into law in 2021, amended the GMA to instruct local governments to “plan for and accommodate” housing affordable to all income levels. This significantly strengthened the previous language, which was that local governments must “encourage” affordable housing.

1.1 Housing Element Requirements

The statute amendment also directed Commerce to project future housing needs for jurisdictions by income bracket and made significant updates to how jurisdictions are to plan for housing in the housing element of the comprehensive plan. Per these amendments, the Housing Element must now include:

- **Planning for sufficient land capacity for housing needs**, including all economic segments of the population (moderate, low, very low and extremely low income, as well as emergency housing and permanent supportive housing).
- **Providing for moderate density housing options within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs)**, including but not limited to duplexes, triplexes and townhomes.
- **Making adequate provisions for housing for existing and projected needs for all economic segments of the community**, including documenting programs and actions needed to achieve housing availability.
- **Identifying racially disparate impacts, displacement, and exclusion** in housing policies and regulations, and beginning to undo those impacts; and identifying areas at higher risk of displacement and establishing anti-displacement policies.

This memo provides details on Kitsap County’s response to all these requirements. Commerce provides guidance on preparing various comprehensive plan elements and step-by-step instructions in how to



demonstrate that the land capacity analysis identifies sufficient capacity of land to accommodate all projected housing needs during the twenty-year planning horizon:

- [Establishing Housing Targets for Your Community: County-level considerations for housing planning](#) (July 2023)
- [Guidance for Updating Your Housing Element: Updating your housing element to address new requirements](#) (August 2023)

1.2 Development of Housing Allocations

In October 2022, the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) adopted growth targets for population and employment growth through 2044. These targets are consistent with the GMA and VISION 2050, the regional plan adopted by the Puget Sound Regional Council. The Kitsap County Board of Commissioners formally adopted these targets in January 2023. (These address the first Commerce guidance document referenced above.)

The population targets formed the basis for the development of housing allocations by income band, which are included in the draft comprehensive plan and reproduced in part below:

		Permanent Housing Needs by Income Level (% of Area Median Income)							Emergency Housing** Needs (Temporary)	
		Total	0-30%		>30-50%	>50-80%	>80-100%	>100-120%		>120%
			Non-PSH	PSH						
Unincorporated Kitsap County	Estimated Housing Supply (2020)	69,987	1,802	8	7,335	21,046	13,531	7,815	18,450	153
	Allocation (2020-2044)	14,498	2,768	1,214	2,376	1,996	1,028	1,012	4,103	612

Table 1. Kitsap County Draft Comprehensive Plan Table 1.9 (p. 82)

Kitsap County must plan for and accommodate 14,498 permanent housing units from the 2020 baseline through 2044, plus capacity for 612 emergency housing beds for persons experiencing homelessness.

This report documents how Kitsap County is providing capacity for permanent and emergency housing allocations by income bracket in accordance with published Commerce guidance. Note that the final version of this memo will include the preferred alternative selected by the Board of County Commissioners.

2. Land Capacity Analysis

2.1 Alternatives Summary

Kitsap County has completed a land capacity analysis as part of the comprehensive plan update. Capacity is provided in terms of net acres, single-family units, and multifamily units by zone and by UGA. Capacity was calculated in this fashion for all three alternatives developed in the draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and for the Preferred Alternative analyzed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Those three alternatives are as follows:

- Alternative 1, “No Action” - Alternative 1 uses current land use, urban growth area sizes and configurations, and zoning and development regulations. Generally, it does not accommodate future population and employment growth. Alternative 1 establishes the baseline for environmental review and potential changes in action alternatives (2 and 3).
- Alternative 2, “Compact Growth/Urban Center Focus” - Alternative 2 is based on meeting proposed population and employment distributions set by VISION 2050 and the Countywide Planning Policies (“bending the trend” of past growth patterns).
- Alternative 3, “Dispersed Growth Focus” - Alternative 3 is closer to past growth trends, housing, and employment types. Minor increased growth opportunities in rural areas. Some UGA expansions but, countywide, UGAs are generally stable. Proposes new policies and regulations that may reduce development potential in UGAs. Opportunities are provided in rural areas for additional rural housing and employment.
- The Preferred Alternative, as recommended by the County Board of Commissioners, is described as the following:
 - In development of this recommendation, the Board considered the contents for the draft documents, all public comment received, the Planning Commission recommendation and staff feedback. Based on this review their direction on major policies, UGA boundaries and land use maps assumed the following:
 - The Planning Commission recommendation, whose foundation was Alternative 2 (Focused Growth), is most in line with regional planning, GMA-consistency and new Commerce requirements. It comes closest to addressing future growth including balancing population and housing needs and achieving employment targets. The Board used this Recommendation as the foundation for their direction.
 - The Preferred Alternative should acknowledge potential Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) changes and their implications on developable land.
 - Rural areas have substantial existing capacity well beyond the 20-year forecast (2024-2044). While improving dramatically, our rural to urban development ratios are not yet meeting Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) policies.



- Increasing housing diversity including missing middle (e.g. townhomes, duplexes, row and cottage housing) and multi-family housing is a priority. This is a priority primarily in urban centers but also throughout UGAs to improve housing accessibility and improve racial disparities in housing.
- Based on review of the draft documents, environmental analysis, public outreach and state and regional requirements, the Board of Commissioners directed the following findings for the Preferred Alternative:
 - All rural-to-rural reclassification requests should be referred to a 2025+ planning process. This does not apply to any rural requests that requested to be included in urban growth areas (UGAs). Such requests will be decided with the 2024 Comprehensive Plan adoption in December 2024.
 - UGA expansions should be limited to those that increase housing diversity, provide industrial employment opportunities, include existing urban development, entitlements or services, and/or further annexation/incorporation goals.
 - Multi-family and missing middle housing should be promoted through regulation revisions and incentives are necessary to promote housing diversity.
 - Maximum densities and heights should be increased, particularly in Regional and Countywide Centers.
 - Parking, lot size and lot dimension regulations should be revised.
 - Expedited permitting should be available to multi-family projects in the Centers.
 - The Preferred Alternative should assess development limitations based on the environmental protections included in the March 8th Draft Critical Areas Ordinance. For example, the draft includes riparian buffer expansions along streams (both Fish and Non-Fish) and their implications on urban development potential must be considered in land capacity.
 - Tree canopy requirements should be established that strongly incentivize the retention of mature and/or significant trees.

2.2 Step 1: Summarize land capacity for housing production by zone

The following table summarizes housing capacity by zone for the preferred alternative and compared to current conditions (alternative 1).

Zone	Preferred Alternative Capacity				Change from Alternative 1, Total Units
	Net Acres	SF Units	MF Units	Total Units	
Commercial	38.53	0	1117	1117	1070
Commercial – Center ¹	2.00	0	375	375	n/a
Commercial – Corridor ²	15.59	0	360	360	n/a
Greenbelt	55.39	90	0	90	-3
Low Intensity Commercial	0.81	0	3	3	-6
Neighborhood Commercial	0.00	0	0	0	0
Regional Center	51.53	0	1491	1491	1406
Residential High	0.00	0	0	0	0
Residential Low	90.17	367	0	367	-21
Residential Medium	0.00	0	0	0	0
Urban Cluster Residential	17.35	1034	0	1034	84
Urban High Residential	54.10	0	1230	1230	500
Urban High Residential – Center ¹	5.49	0	155	155	n/a
Urban Low Residential	808.96	4347	0	4347	-141
Urban Medium Residential	103.57	0	1348	1348	416
Urban Medium Residential – RC ³	16.01	0	183	183	n/a
Urban Restricted Residential	211.07	707	0	707	-58
Urban Village Center	14.24	0	57	57	40
All Zones	1,484.79	6,545	6,319	12,864	4,360

Table 2. Land Capacity Analysis Summary by Zone in the Preferred Alternative. Source: Kitsap County, May 2024

- 1: Central Kitsap UGA only.
- 2: Port Orchard UGA only.
- 3: Silverdale UGA only.

This analysis, completed by Kitsap County staff in summer 2023 for the preliminary alternatives and spring 2024 for the preferred alternative, addressed steps 1.1 through 1.5 of the Commerce housing element guidance to define development status, remove infrastructure gaps, critical areas, and other areas unlikely to develop, account for rights of way and future capital facilities, and determine net acres.

Capacity in rural zones is estimated as a residual in later steps in this analysis.

2.3 Additional capacity for ADUs on developed lots

Kitsap County has permitted roughly 20 ADUs over the past 5 years. Looking out over the next 20 years and accounting for the changes in state law via HB 1337, we anticipate that a maximum of 200 ADUs



would be permitted over the next 20 years in Kitsap County’s UGAs. (Kitsap County does not assign any ADU capacity to rural zones.) Per Commerce guidance, these units can be included with zones in the low- and mid-rise residential zoning categories.

3. Classify zones by allowed housing types and density levels

The next step of the analysis identifies which housing types are allowed in each zone to facilitate relating each zone category to potential affordability levels.

3.1 Categories for classifying zones by housing types allowed

Zone Category	Typical housing types allowed
Low Density	Detached single-family homes
Moderate Density	Townhomes, duplex, triplex, quadplex
Low-Rise Multifamily	Walk-up apartments or condominiums (up to 3 floors)
Mid-Rise Multifamily	Apartments or condominiums in buildings with ~4 to 8 floors (~40-85 feet in height)

Table 3. Zone Categories and Housing Types Allowed

*Manufactured homes not listed as a housing type because by law they should be allowed in all zones.

3.2 Classifying land use zones using zone categories

Zone	Alternative(s)	Housing types allowed	Max density level/height allowed	Assigned zone category
Commercial	All	Duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, single-family detached	30 du/ac, 35 ft	Low-Rise Multifamily
Commercial – Center (Central Kitsap UGA)	2, Preferred			
Commercial – Corridor (Port Orchard UGA)	2, Preferred			
Greenbelt	All	Duplex, mobile home, single-family attached,	4 du/ac, 35 ft	Low Density

Zone	Alternative(s)	Housing types allowed	Max density level/height allowed	Assigned zone category
		single-family detached		
Low Intensity Commercial	All	Duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, single-family detached	20 du/ac (up to 30 in Gorst), 25 ft (up to 45 ft in Gorst)	Low-Rise Multifamily
Neighborhood Commercial	All	Duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, single-family detached	30 du/ac, 35 ft	Low-Rise Multifamily
Regional Center	All	Duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, single-family detached	60 du/ac, 45-85 ft (125 ft in a couple sub-areas)	Mid-Rise Multifamily
Residential High (Poulsbo UTA)	All	Multifamily, Single-family	14 du/ac, 35 ft	Low-Rise Multifamily
Residential Low (Poulsbo UTA)	All	Single-family detached	5 du/ac, 35 ft	Low Density
Residential Medium (Poulsbo UTA)	All	Multifamily, single-family	10 du/ac, 35 ft	Moderate Density
Rural and Resource Zones (RR, RP, RW, FRL)	All	Single-family detached	1 du/5 acres to 1 du/40 acres	Low Density
Urban Cluster Residential	All	Cottage, duplex, mobile home, multifamily, single-family attached, single-family detached	9 du/ac, 35 ft	Moderate Density
Urban High Residential	All	Cottage, duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, single-family detached	30 du/ac, 55 ft	Mid-Rise Multifamily
Urban High Residential – Center (Central Kitsap UGA)	2, Preferred			Mid-Rise Multifamily



Zone	Alternative(s)	Housing types allowed	Max density level/height allowed	Assigned zone category
Urban High Residential – RC (Silverdale UGA)	2, Preferred			Mid-Rise Multifamily
Urban Low Residential	All	Cottage, duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, mobile home, single-family detached	9 du/ac, 35 ft	Low Density/Moderate Density/Low-Rise Multifamily ¹
Urban Medium Residential	All	Cottage, duplex, multifamily, single-family attached, mobile home, single-family detached	18 du/ac, 45 ft	Mid-Rise Multifamily
Urban Medium Residential - RC	2, Preferred			Mid-Rise Multifamily
Urban Restricted Residential	All	Duplex, mobile home, single-family attached, single-family detached	5 du/ac (up to 10 in Gorst), 35 ft	Low Density
Urban Village Center	All	Duplex, single-family attached, single-family detached	No max density, 45 ft	Mid-Rise Multifamily

Table 4. Classification of Zone Categories using County Zones

3.4 Relate zone categories to potential income levels served

Zone Category	Typical housing types allowed	Lowest potential income level served		Assumed affordability level for capacity analysis
		Market rate	With subsidies and/or incentives	
Low Density	Detached single-family homes	Higher income (>120% AMI)	Not typically feasible at scale*	Higher income (>120% AMI)
Moderate Density	Townhomes, duplex, triplex, quadplex	Moderate income (81-100%, 101-120% AMI)	Not typically feasible at scale*	Moderate income (81-120% AMI)
Low-Rise Multifamily	Walk-up apartments, condominiums (2-3 floors)	Low income (51-80% AMI)	Extremely low and very low income (0-50% AMI)	Low Income (0-80% AMI) and PSH
Mid-Rise Multifamily	Apartments, condominiums	Low income (51-80% AMI)	Extremely low and very low income (0-50% AMI)	Low income (0-80% AMI) and PSH
ADUs (all zones)	Accessory Dwelling Units on developed residential lots	Low income (51-80% AMI)	N/A	Low income (51-80% AMI) – Group with Low-Rise and/or Mid-Rise Multifamily

Table 5. Zone Categories Analysis for Affordability Levels

The Urban Low zone allows a diverse range of housing types, but it currently has a maximum density of 9 dwelling units per acre. This is on the edge of the boundary between low density and moderate density. In some locations (for example, heavily encumbered sites in countywide or regional centers), one might even expect some low-rise multifamily. This is especially true for the Preferred Alternative, which features several code changes, including loosening of bulk regulation restrictions and raising of the maximum density to 14 dwelling units per acre in Urban Low. Therefore, we used multipliers for the non-pipeline capacity in Urban Low in each Urban Growth Area to assign fractions of capacity to low-density, moderate density, and low-rise multifamily that vary by UGA. See the table below for the multipliers used and resulting capacity across the different types of housing. Note that pipeline capacity in Urban Low is counted as moderate density in Table 4 due to its development regulations and allowed uses as described in Commerce guidance. However, because it is a flexible zone, especially under the proposed code changes in the Preferred Alternative, it is likely to be developed in a mix of housing types that vary by UGA.



UGA	Non-Pipeline Capacity	SF Detached Multiplier	SF Detached Units	Moderate Density Multiplier	Moderate Density Units	MF Multiplier	MF Units
Bremerton East	199.1	0.4	80	0.4	80	0.2	40
Bremerton West	309.2	0.6	185	0.4	124	0	0
Central Kitsap	389.2	0.6	233	0.4	156	0	0
Kingston	354.2	0.6	212	0.4	142	0	0
Port Orchard	347.8	0.6	209	0.4	139	0	0
Silverdale	479.3	0.4	192	0.5	240	0.1	48

Table 6. Multipliers for Varying Housing Types in Urban Low Zone, by UGA and Alternative

4. Summarize Capacity by Zone Category

For each EIS alternative, the summary capacity by zone category is shown below. This sums the capacity per zone into the assigned zone category to determine capacity relative to need in the last step.

4.1 Alternative 1

Zone	Unit Capacity	Assigned Zone Category	Capacity in Zone Category ¹²
Commercial	0	Low-Rise Multifamily	78
Low Intensity Commercial	9	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Neighborhood Commercial	0	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Low (Low-Rise MF Share)	69	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Regional Center	85	Mid-Rise Multifamily	1,587
Residential High	0	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential	710	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Medium Residential	779	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Village Center	13	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Residential Medium	0	Moderate Density	1,148
Urban Cluster Residential	147	Moderate Density	
Urban Low Residential (Moderate Density Share)	1001	Moderate Density	
Greenbelt	93	Low Density	4,627
Residential Low	388	Low Density	
Urban Low (Low Density Share)	2,463	Low Density	
Urban Restricted Residential	708	Low Density	
Rural and Resource Zones	975	Low Density	

Table 7. Alternative 1 Capacity by Zone Category

¹ Pipeline projects have been removed from the capacity figures in this table. They have been added back into the summary tables (following pages) to ensure capacity and growth targets can be adequately compared.

² Pipeline units in Urban Low, Urban Cluster, and Urban Medium zones were all single-family residential plats and have been added back in the >120% zone category.



4.2 Alternative 2

Zone	Unit Capacity	Assigned Zone Category	Capacity in Zone Category ³⁴
Commercial	1,158	Low-Rise Multifamily	2,492
Commercial - Center	385	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Commercial – Corridor	438	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Low Intensity Commercial	9	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Neighborhood Commercial	0	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Low (Low-Rise MF Share)	502	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Regional Center	1,529	Mid-Rise Multifamily	5,018
Residential High	0	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential	786	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential – Center	430	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential – RC	501	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Medium Residential	1,534	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Medium Residential - RC	185	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Village Center	53	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Residential Medium	0	Moderate Density	2,108
Urban Cluster Residential	246	Moderate Density	
Urban Low (Moderate Density Share)	1,862	Moderate Density	
Greenbelt	93	Low Density	3,369
Residential Low	388	Low Density	
Urban Low (Low Density Share)	1,211		
Urban Restricted Residential	700	Low Density	
Rural and Resource Zones	977	Low Density	

Table 8. Alternative 2 Capacity by Zone Category

³ Pipeline projects have been removed from the capacity figures in this table. They have been added back into the summary tables (following pages) to ensure capacity and growth targets can be adequately compared.

⁴ Pipeline units in Urban Low, Urban Cluster, and Urban Medium zones were all single-family residential plats and have been added back in the >120% zone category.

4.3 Alternative 3

Zone	Unit Capacity	Assigned Zone Category	Capacity in Zone Category ⁵⁶
Commercial	1,236	Low-Rise Multifamily	1,304
Low Intensity Commercial	7	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Neighborhood Commercial	0	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Low (Low-Rise MF Share)	61	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Regional Center	244	Mid-Rise Multifamily	1,961
Residential High	0	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential	846	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Medium Residential	856	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Village Center	15	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Residential Medium	0	Moderate Density	1,979
Urban Cluster Residential	881	Moderate Density	
Urban Low Residential (Moderate Density Share)	1,098	Moderate Density	
Greenbelt	82	Low Density	5,210
Residential Low	1,021	Low Density	
Urban Low (Low Density Share)	2,421	Low Density	
Urban Restricted Residential	664	Low Density	
Rural and Resource Zones	1,022	Low Density	

Table 9. Alternative 3 Capacity by Zone Category

⁵ Pipeline projects have been removed from the capacity figures in this table. They have been added back into the summary tables (following pages) to ensure capacity and growth targets can be adequately compared.

⁶ Pipeline units in Urban Low, Urban Cluster, and Urban Medium zones were all single-family residential plats and have been added back in the >120% zone category.



4.4 Preferred Alternative

Zone	Unit Capacity	Assigned Zone Category	Capacity in Zone Category ⁷⁸
Commercial	735	Low-Rise Multifamily	1,949
Commercial - Center	374	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Commercial – Corridor	360	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Low Intensity Commercial	3	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Neighborhood Commercial	0	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Low (Low-Rise MF Share)	477	Low-Rise Multifamily	
Regional Center	1,529	Mid-Rise Multifamily	4,238
Residential High	0	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential	786	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential – Center	430	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban High Residential – RC	501	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Medium Residential	1,534	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Medium Residential - RC	185	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Urban Village Center	53	Mid-Rise Multifamily	
Residential Medium	0	Moderate Density	1,874
Urban Cluster Residential	246	Moderate Density	
Urban Low (Moderate Density Share)	1,862	Moderate Density	
Greenbelt	93	Low Density	2,418
Residential Low	388	Low Density	
Urban Low (Low Density Share)	1,211		
Urban Restricted Residential	700	Low Density	
Rural and Resource Zones	977	Low Density	

Table 10. Preferred Alternative Capacity by Zone Category

⁷ Pipeline projects have been removed from the capacity figures in this table. They have been added back into the summary tables (following pages) to ensure capacity and growth targets can be adequately compared.

⁸ Pipeline units in Urban Low, Urban Cluster, and Urban Medium zones were all single-family residential plats and have been added back in the >120% zone category.

5. Compare projected housing needs to capacity

The projected housing need column shows Kitsap County's allocation of need by income group as well as for PSH. These needs are aggregated into the zone categories that match those in the leftmost column of Table 3. The "aggregated housing needs" column shows the total housing needs for all income levels in each zone category minus pipeline projects attributed to those zones or housing types. The "total capacity" column comes from Tables 7, 8, and 9. The rightmost column shows the surplus or (deficit) of capacity by zone category. This is done for all three alternatives. Note that the projected housing need totals 14,497 when the income categories are summed; this is one unit shy of the 14,498 reported in the HAPT table. This is likely due to either rounding or a typo; this analysis uses 14,497 to ensure individual data points match the control total.

5.1 Alternative 1

Income Level (% AMI)	Projected Housing Need ⁹	Zone Categories Serving These Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs ¹⁰	Total Capacity	Capacity Surplus (Deficit)
0-30% PSH	1,214	Low-Rise Multifamily, Mid-Rise Multifamily, ADUs	8,283 (non-pipeline) + 71 (pipeline) = 8,354	1,665 (non-pipeline) + 71 (pipeline) + 381 ADU = 2,046	(6,237)
0-30% Non-PSH	2,768				
31-50%	2,376				
51-80%	1,996	Moderate Density	2,040	1,148	(892)
81-100%	1,028				
101-120%	1,012				
>120%	4,103	Low Density	2,332 (non-pipeline) + 1,771 (pipeline) = 4,103	4,627 (non-pipeline) + 1,771 (pipeline) = 6,398	2,295
Total	14,497		12,655 (non-pipeline) + 1,842 (pipeline) = 14,497	9,592 (including 1,842 pipeline units)	(4,905)

⁹ From 2020-2044 Housing Allocations

¹⁰ Pipeline projects added in separately based on unit type.



Table 11. Projected Need vs. Capacity, Alternative 1

5.2 Alternative 2

Income Level (% AMI)	Projected Housing Need	Zone Categories Serving These Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs ¹¹	Total Capacity	Capacity Surplus (Deficit)
0-30% PSH	1,214	Low-Rise Multifamily, Mid-Rise Multifamily, ADUs	8,283 (non-pipeline) + 71 (pipeline) = 8,354	7,510 (non-pipeline) + 71 (pipeline) + 381 ADU = 7,962	(392)
0-30% Non-PSH	2,768				
31-50%	2,376				
51-80%	1,996				
81-100%	1,028	Moderate Density	2,040	2,108	68
101-120%	1,012				
>120%	4,103	Low Density	2,332 (non-pipeline) + 1,771 (pipeline) = 4,103	3,369 (non-pipeline) + 1,771 (pipeline) = 5,140	1,037
Total	14,497		12,655 (non-pipeline) + 1,842 (pipeline) = 14,497	15,210 (including 1,842 pipeline units)	713

Table 12. Projected Need vs. Capacity, Alternative 2

5.3 Alternative 3

Income Level (% AMI)	Projected Housing Need	Zone Categories Serving These Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs ¹²	Total Capacity	Capacity Surplus (Deficit)
0-30% PSH	1,214	Low-Rise Multifamily, Mid-Rise Multifamily	8,283 (non-pipeline) + 71 (pipeline) = 8,354	3,265 (non-pipeline) + 71 (pipeline) + 381 ADU = 3,717	(4,637)
0-30% Non-PSH	2,768				
31-50%	2,376				
51-80%	1,996				
81-100%	1,028		2,040	1,979	(61)

¹¹ Pipeline projects added in separately based on unit type.

¹² Same as above

101-120%	1,012	Moderate Density			
>120%	4,103	Low Density	2,332 (non-pipeline) + 1,771 (pipeline) = 4,103	5,210 (non-pipeline) + 1,771 (pipeline) = 6,981	2,878
Total	14,497		12,655 (non-pipeline) + 1,842 (pipeline) = 14,497	12,677 (including 1,842 pipeline units)	(1,820)

Table 13. Projected Need vs. Capacity, Alternative 3

5.4 Preferred Alternative

Income Level (% AMI)	Projected Housing Need	Zone Categories Serving These Needs	Aggregated Housing Needs ¹³	Total Capacity	Capacity Surplus (Deficit)
0-30% PSH	1,214	Low-Rise Multifamily, Mid-Rise Multifamily, ADUs	7,747 (non-pipeline) + 607 (pipeline) = 8,354	6,187 (non-pipeline) + 607 (pipeline) + 381 ADU = 7,175	(1,179)
0-30% Non-PSH	2,768				
31-50%	2,376				
51-80%	1,996				
81-100%	1,028	Moderate Density	2,040	1,874	(166)
101-120%	1,012				
>120%	4,103	Low Density	2,342 (non-pipeline) + 1,761 (pipeline) = 4,103	2,418 (non-pipeline) + 1,761 (pipeline) = 4,179	76
Total	14,497		12,129 (non-pipeline) + 2,368 (pipeline) = 14,497	13,228 (including 2,368 pipeline units and 381 ADUs)	(1,269)

¹³ Pipeline projects added in separately based on unit type.



Table 14. Projected Need vs Capacity, Preferred Alternative

6. Evaluating capacity for emergency housing needs

Only one facility offering emergency shelter beds serving Kitsap County residents is actually located in unincorporated Kitsap County – a pipeline project with 75 beds known as the Pacific Building Shelter, which will serve the South Kitsap area. After accounting for these 75 beds, Kitsap County’s remaining emergency housing need is $612 - 75 = \mathbf{537 \text{ beds}}$.

A geospatial query was performed on Land Capacity Analysis GIS data to follow the data process outlined in Commerce housing element guidance:

- Identify all parcels in zones allowing indoor emergency housing and indoor emergency shelters (“Group Living” under Kitsap County Code, permitted or ACUP in the UL, UM, UR, GB, UCR, UH, C, RC, LIC, UVC, NC, RCO, P zones): 25,696 parcels
- Narrow parcel search (vacant and underutilized parcels according to the LCA (includes deducting critical areas and buffers), parcels in infrastructure gap areas removed, net developable acreage of at least 0.1, hotels and motels current use): 1,395 parcels
- Amend based on pending permits and pipeline projects (already accounted for by using vacant and underutilized parcels): 1,395 parcels
- Adopt any spacing or intensity requirements to the parcels (no adopted spacing or intensity requirements for indoor emergency shelter): 1,395 parcels
- Calculate capacity based on occupancy/intensity or assumed density methods.

The Pacific Building Shelter, which when it opens will have 75 beds available on 2.75 acres and will be unincorporated Kitsap County’s only indoor emergency shelter, can serve as an assumed density for calculating capacity for the parcels with potential capacity as identified above. $75 \text{ beds} / 2.75 \text{ gross (net) acres} = \mathbf{27.3 \text{ beds per net acre}}$

The 1,395 parcels identified above are further refined by eliminating the largest vacant and underutilized parcels to eliminate skew in the data. This results in 1,340 parcels with capacity for **31,291 emergency housing beds**.

7. Adequate Provisions Documentation

RCW 36.70A.070(2)(d) requires jurisdictions planning under the GMA to include in their comprehensive plan a housing element that “[m]akes adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community, including:

- (i) Incorporating consideration for low, very low, extremely low, and moderate-income households;
- (ii) Documenting programs and actions needed to achieve housing availability including gaps in local funding, barriers such as development regulations, and other limitations;
- (iii) Consideration of housing locations in relation to employment location; and
- (iv) Consideration of the role of accessory dwelling units in meeting housing needs.”

7.1 Housing units needed to manage both current and projected housing needs, broken down by income bracket

Income Level	Percent Area Median Income	Net New Units Needed, 2020-2044
Extremely Low Income	0-30% Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH)	1,214
	0-30% Other (Non-PSH)	2,768
Very Low Income	>30-50%	2,376
Low Income	>50-80%	1,996
Moderate	>80-100%	1,028
	>100-120%	1,012
Above Moderate	>120%	4,103
Total		14,497
Temporary housing needs		Net new beds needed, 2020-2044
Emergency Housing/Shelter		537

Table 15. Review of Housing Unit Need by Income Level



7.2 Documenting programs and actions needed to achieve housing availability

Kitsap County is not required to construct housing or ensure that housing is produced. However, the County must identify barriers to housing production and make adequate provisions to accommodate all housing needs. Alternative 1 of the Environmental Impact Statement (draft released on December 15, 2023), the “No Action” alternative, falls far short of making adequate provisions for those making 80 percent or less of the median income.

Under Alternative 2 (and the Preferred Alternative), the following analysis demonstrates how the County makes adequate provisions to accommodate all housing needs.

7.2.1 Review housing production trends to determine if barriers exist

Zone	SF Units	SF Historical average annual trend (7 yr)	MF Units	MF Historical average annual trend (7 yr)	ADUs	Total Units	Total Historical average annual trend
Greenbelt	7	1	0	0	1	8	1.1
Urban Restricted	199	28.4	2	0.3	0	201	28.7
Urban Low Residential	510	72.9	24	3.4	3	537	76.7
Urban Medium Residential	217	31	24	3.4	1	242	34.6
Urban High Residential	12	1.7	0	0	0	12	1.7
Mixed Use ¹⁴	2	0.3	41	5.9	0	43	6.1
Total Urban	937	133.9	100	14.3	5	1,043	149
Rural Residential	1,296	185.1	0	0	21	1,317	188.1
Rural Protection	239	34.1	0	0	7	246	35.1
Rural Wooded	60	8.6	0	0	1	61	8.7
Total Rural	1,595	227.9	0	0	29	1,624	232

Table 16. Residential Building Permits in Unincorporated Kitsap County, 2013-2019 (2021 Buildable Lands Report, Facet analysis)

¹⁴ The mixed use zone was established in the 2006 comprehensive plan but removed in the 2016 comp plan update and during the evaluation period for the Buildable Lands Report.

Income level (% AMI)	Projected housing need (2020-2044)	Housing type(s) that best serve these needs	Aggregated housing need (2020-2044)	Annual unit production needed	Historical average annual unit production ¹⁵	Is there a barrier to sufficient production?
0-30% PSH	1,214	Low-Rise and Mid-Rise (walk-ups up to 3 stories, apartments, condos)	8,354	348	42	YES
0-30% Non-PSH	2,768					
>30-50%	2,376					
>50-80%	1,996					
>80-100%	1,028	Moderate Density (townhomes, duplex, triplex, 4-plex) + ADUs	2,040	85	76.7	YES
>100-120%	1,012					
>120%	4,103	Low Density (single family detached)	4,103	171	262	NO

Table 17. Comparison of production trends to housing needs to determine if barriers exist

¹⁵ Rounded to the nearest half-unit from BLR table on previous page



7.3 Gather information to determine what kind(s) of barriers exist

7.3.1 Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
Development regulations			
Unclear development regulations	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definitions related to land divisions located in Title 21 (land use and development procedures), not Title 16 (Land Division and Development) • Inconsistent definitions identified in Titles 16 and 17 • Public street and street connectivity requirements located in Title 17 (Zoning) instead of Title 16 (Land Division and Development) • Unclear recreational open space tract locations • Inconsistency between Shoreline Master Program and development regulations on maximum building heights in shoreline jurisdiction • Performance Based Development (PBD) not effective (rarely used and causes confusion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split-zoned site development regulations clarified (17.120.040.C) • Moved single-family subdivision and development standards from Title 17 to Title 16 • Definitions revised for clarity re: boarding houses, cottage housing, day care centers, and various residential development types (17.110.112, 196, 200, 205, 245, 504, 682, and 683) • Consolidated Performance Based Development (PBD) permit (17.450) with Subdivision Permit, so it can all be done under one review.
Prohibiting some moderate density housing	No	Most urban zones in existing code/comp plan actually allow duplexes,	N/A

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
types, such as: duplexes, triplexes, four/five/six-plexes, townhomes, cottage housing, live-work units, manufactured home parks		townhouses, cottage housing, mobile homes, and multifamily housing. The issue is more with the dimensional regulations (see next row)	
High minimum lot sizes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing development regulations contain various barriers to middle housing and multifamily, especially density, setbacks, lot coverage, impervious surface maximums, and more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum lot sizes and dimensions are reduced or removed from many urban residential zones to improve development flexibility (17.420.052)
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing development regulations contain various barriers to middle housing and multifamily, especially density, setbacks, lot coverage, impervious surface maximums, and more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase max density from 9 du to 14 du/ac in Urban Low and Urban Cluster zones if development is attached, cottage, or multifamily Minimum density in commercial zone increased from 10 du/acre to 19 du/acre(17.420.054) Maximum density for Commercial in Kingston removed (17.420.054) Removed max density in the RC zone, increased allowed heights in Silverdale Regional Center (17.420.058)
Low maximum building heights	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building height limitations, especially in Silverdale, limit provision of enough 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased max density, allowed heights in Silverdale Regional Center and in Commercial zone and many



Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
		housing below 80% AMI	UGAs in the County (17.420.058)
Large setback requirements	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urban residential zones have side setbacks that are a disincentive to attached housing. Some urban zones have front setbacks that also may limit developable area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions (from 20' to 10' for habitable space and 0' side setback for attached housing) and standardization of setbacks for urban residential zones (17.420.052)
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current standards have off-street parking requirements that preclude garage spaces from counting toward the parking requirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update and reduce residential parking standards. Allow 1 garage space to county toward parking requirement (17.490.030)
High impervious coverage limits	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Off-street parking standards do not allow permeable pavement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove maximum impervious surface area requirements for Silverdale Regional Center (17.420.058) Off-street parking standards revised to allow permeable pavement in parking areas (17.490.020)
Lack of alignment between building codes and development codes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	N/A
Other	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No max size of cottage housing units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise definition to clarify development characteristics. Create cap of 1,000 square feet per unit (17.110.196)
Process Obstacles			
Conditional use permit process	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some permits require quasi-judicial approval of subdivisions and site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New section in Title 16 allows for administrative approval of amendments

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
		development activity permits <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-family construction is an administrative conditional use in several zones 	to SDAPs related to subdivisions in certain situations (16.40.040.D.1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACUP to P for multi-family in Urban Village Commercial (17.410.044)
Design review	No		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Silverdale Regional Center Plan includes goals and policies calling for adopting and updating development and design standards. However, the County does not have a “design review” procedure that forms a barrier to moderate-density housing.
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADU regulations do not comply with HB 1337 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact fees for ADUs not to exceed 50 percent of single-family dwelling fees
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADU regulations do not comply with HB 1337 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact fees for ADUs not to exceed 50 percent of single-family dwelling fees
Process times and staffing challenges	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit time represents a cost that is passed on to consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County is implementing expedited permit review program
Limited Land Availability and Environmental Constraints			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Environmental constraints	Potentially	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAO updates may result in increased buffers in some instances, reducing availability of sites with development capacity. PBD code is unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated Performance Based Development (PBD) permit (17.450) with Subdivision Permit, so it can all be done under one review. CAO update (forthcoming)



Table 18. Moderate Density housing barrier review checklist

7.3.2 Low-Rise or Mid-Rise housing barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
Development regulations			
Unclear development regulations	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent definitions identified in Titles 16 and 17 • Public street and street connectivity requirements located in Title 17 (Zoning) instead of Title 16 (Land Division and Development) • Unclear recreational open space tract locations • Inconsistency between Shoreline Master Program and development regulations on maximum building heights in shoreline jurisdiction • Performance Based Development (PBD) not effective (rarely used and causes confusion) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Split-zoned site development regulations clarified (17.120.040.C) • Moved single-family subdivision and development standards from Title 17 to Title 16 • Definitions revised for clarity re: boarding houses, cottage housing, day care centers, and various residential development types (17.110.112, 196, 200, 205, 245, 504, 682, and 683) • Consolidated Performance Based Development (PBD) permit (17.450) with Subdivision Permit, so it can all be done under one review. • Expand modification process for multifamily development and provide criteria for allowing greater building heights and adjustments to parking circulation (17.420.035)
High minimum lot sizes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing development regulations contain various barriers to multifamily housing, especially density, setbacks, lot coverage, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimum lot sizes and dimensions are removed from many urban residential zones to improve development flexibility (17.420.052)

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
		impervious surface maximums, and more	
Low maximum densities or low maximum FAR	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing development regulations contain various barriers to middle housing and multifamily, especially density, setbacks, lot coverage, impervious surface maximums, and more 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum density in Commercial zone increased (17.420.054) Maximum density for Commercial in Kingston removed (17.420.054) Increased max density, allowed heights in Silverdale Regional Center (17.420.058)
Low maximum building heights	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building height limitations, especially in Silverdale, limit provision of enough housing below 80% AMI Stair shafts are included in max building height 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased max density, allowed heights in Silverdale Regional Center (17.420.058) Increased maximum heights for construction with flexibility to build higher if providing public benefits in Commercial and High Urban zones (17.420.052, 054 and 060(62)) Allow stairs and stair shafts to exceed max building height (17.420.060(40)) Increased allowed heights in Commercial Zone (17.420.054)
Large setback requirements	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Setbacks are already zero or very small for zones where low- and mid-rise residential are allowed and are the focus 	N/A
High off-street parking requirements	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking requirements for commercial and residential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update and reduce residential parking standards (Alternative 2).



Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
		uses potentially a barrier to adding more units	Allow 1 garage space to count toward parking requirement (17.490.030) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update and reduce some commercial parking standards to apply High Capacity Transit Station standards to all commercial uses (Alternative 2) (17.490.030)
High impervious coverage limits	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> allowance of higher impervious coverage allows for higher densities while accommodating off street parking. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove maximum impervious surface area requirements for Silverdale Regional Center (17.420.058) Off-street parking standards revised to allow permeable pavement in parking areas (17.490.020)
Lack of alignment between building codes and development codes	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	N/A
Other	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum lot coverage in the Urban High zone is inconsistent with adjacent Commercial zoned land 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maximum lot coverage for Urban High is removed consistent with requirements for adjacent Commercial land (17.420.052)
Process Obstacles			
Conditional use permit process	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multifamily units are an administrative conditional use permit in some zones. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ACUP to P for multi-family in Urban Village Commercial (17.410.044)
Design review	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Silverdale Regional Center Plan includes goals and policies calling for adopting and updating development and design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
		standards. However, the County does not have a “design review” procedure that forms a barrier to moderate-density housing.	
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADU regulations do not comply with HB 1337 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact fees for ADUs not to exceed 50 percent of single-family dwelling fees
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ADU regulations do not comply with HB 1337 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact fees for ADUs not to exceed 50 percent of single-family dwelling fees
Process times and staffing challenges	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Permit time represents a cost that is passed on to consumers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County is implementing expedited permit review program
Limited Land Availability and Environmental Constraints			
Lack of large parcels for infill development	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Environmental constraints	Potentially	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CAO updates may result in increased buffers in some instances, reducing availability of sites with development capacity. PBD code is unclear. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consolidated Performance Based Development (PBD) permit (17.450) with Subdivision Permit, so it can all be done under one review. CAO update (forthcoming)
Gaps in local funding	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No financial incentive for development of affordable units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-family tax exemption program (MFTE) if/when the program becomes available to Kitsap County.



Table 19. Low- to Mid-Rise Multifamily housing barrier review checklist

7.3.3 Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) and emergency housing

As noted in the previous section, Kitsap County has ample capacity for emergency housing. However, the permanent supportive housing and emergency housing analysis is as follows.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
Development regulations			
Spacing requirements (for example, minimum distance from parks, schools or other emergency/PSH housing facilities)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County does not have spacing requirements for permanent supportive housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Parking requirements	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> County currently requires 1.5 spaces per multifamily unit plus 0.5 per unit on the street or set aside Parking for emergency housing or non-multifamily iterations of PSH determined by the director 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reductions and standardization in parking requirements (17.490.030)
On-site recreation and open space requirements	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No open space or recreation space requirements that are different from multifamily 	N/A
Restrictions on support spaces, such as office space, within a transitional or PSH building in a residential zone	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no standards specific to office support within permanent supportive housing or group housing. There is a lack of clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSH should have its own definitions and standards in KCC 17.110.318. Additional code is needed to clarify rules for PSH and indoor emergency shelter.

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
Arbitrary limits on number of occupants (in conflict with RCW 35A.21.314)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group living (one to 6 rooms) shall meet minimum density and shall not exceed the maximum density for the zone or 6 boarding rooms, whichever is greater • Group living (seven or more rooms) shall meet the minimum density and shall not exceed the maximum density for the zone or six boarding rooms, whichever is greater • Transitory accommodations (17.505) 	May need additional code on this – transitory accommodations do not apply to PSH as written but contain separate standards
Requirements for PSH or emergency housing that are different than the requirements imposed on housing developments generally (in conflict with RCW 36.130.020)	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no standards specific to office support within permanent supportive housing or group housing. There is a lack of clarity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • development standards for PSH should be established in order to comply with RCW 36.130.020. Standards cannot be more restrictive than standard housing developments however preferential treatment for affordable housing, such as reduces setbacks, parking standards, etc. can be implemented. If reduced standards are not desired it should be established that the same standards apply to PSH that apply to standard housing projects.
Other restrictions specific to emergency shelters,	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no standards specific to office support within permanent supportive housing or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •



Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
emergency housing, transitional housing and permanent supportive housing		group housing. There is a lack of clarity	
Gaps in local funding	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No financial incentive for development of affordable units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sales and use tax for affordable housing (KCC 4.35) as well as sales and use tax for housing-related expenses (KCC 4.34) County is exploring feasibility of MFTE should the statutory basis change within the planning period

Table 20. PSH and Emergency Housing barrier review checklist

7.3.4 Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) barrier review checklist

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
Development regulations			
Must allow two ADUs on each lot in urban growth areas; May not require the owner to occupy the property, and may not prohibit sale as independent units, but may restrict the use of ADUs as short term rentals; Must allow an ADU of at least 1,000 square feet; Must set parking requirements based on distance from transit and lot size; May not charge more than 50% of the impact fees charged for the principal unit;	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various sections of code needed to be revised on account of HB 1337 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Various revisions to section 17.415.010 KCC including Limiting impact fees to 50% of primary dwelling, Increasing ADUs to a maximum of 1,000 sq. ft.,

Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
<p>Must permit ADUs in structures detached from the principal unit; May not restrict roof heights of ADUs to less than 24 feet, unless that limitation applies to the principal unit; May not impose setback requirements, yard coverage limits, tree retention mandates, restrictions on entry door locations, aesthetic requirements, or requirements for design review for ADUs that are more restrictive than those for principal units; Must allow an ADUs on any lot that meets the minimum lot size required for the principal unit; Must allow detached ADUs to be sited at a lot line if the lot line abuts a public alley, unless the city or county routinely plows snow on the public alley; Must allow conversions from existing structures, even if they violate current code requirements for setbacks or lot coverage; and May not require public street improvements as a condition of permitting ADUs.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowing ADUs to be sold independent of principal unit.
Unclear development regulations	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 17.415.010 is clear but is being modified as per the previous line. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • N/A
Large setback requirements	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setback requirements being reduced as part of changes to 17.420.52 KCC, which also apply to ADUs 	N/A
Off-street parking requirements	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to off-street parking requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See previous



Barrier	Is this barrier likely to affect housing production?	Why or why not?	Actions being proposed to address barrier
		in 17.415.010 to comply with HB 1337.	
Other (for example: burdensome design standards, tree retention regulations, historic preservation requirements, open space requirements, etc.)	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No other burdensome standards for ADUs identified in code. 	N/A
Process Obstacles			
Lack of clear and accessible information about process and fees	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kitsap County Code and fee schedules contain specific lines for ADUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Permit fees, impact fees and utility connection fees that are not proportionate to impact	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fee schedule ordinance contains specific line for ACUP for ADUs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> N/A
Processing time and staff challenges	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expedited permitting for multi-family developments

Table 21. ADU barrier review checklist

7.4 Checklist for local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps

Local option tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps*	Implementation Status	Plans for Implementation
Housing and related services sales tax (RCW 82.14.530)	Implemented in KCC 4.34	Already implemented
Affordable housing property tax levy (RCW 84.52.105)		
REET 2 (RCW 82.46.035) GMA jurisdictions only and only available through 2025	Allowed by inference in KCC 4.56	Already implemented

Affordable Housing Sales Tax Credit (RCW 82.14.540) – was only available to jurisdictions through July 2020	Implemented in KCC 4.35	Already implemented
Lodging Tax (RCW 67.28.150 and RCW 67.28.160) to repay general obligation bonds or revenue bonds	Not eligible (only municipalities are eligible)	N/A
Mental Illness and Drug Dependency Tax (RCW 82.14.460) – jurisdictions with a population over 30,000	Implemented in KCC 4.33	Already implemented
Donating surplus public lands for affordable housing projects (RCW 39.33.015)		
Impact fee waivers for affordable housing projects (RCW 82.02.060)	Implemented by KCC 4.110.030	Already implemented
Application fee waivers or other benefits for affordable housing projects (RCW 36.70A.540)	County currently developing an expedited permit review program for multifamily housing projects, including affordable housing projects.	Being implemented concurrent with this comprehensive plan periodic update and associated development regulations amendments.
Multi-Family Tax Exemption (MFTE) with affordable housing requirement (RCW 84.14)	Not currently allowed under RCW, as of 2024	The County is actively studying MFTE to be ready to implement should the statutory situation change within the planning period
General funds (including levy lid lifts to increase funds available)	Not currently being considered.	No plans for implementation

Table 22. Local tools for addressing affordable housing funding gaps



References

Kitsap County Department of Community Development (2023) "Land Capacity Analysis." Workbooks:
https://www.kitsap.gov/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Land_Capacity_POP_EMPLOY_UGA.pdf

Kitsap County Department of Community Development (2023) "Land Capacity Analysis." GIS Data: Provided
by Kitsap County Staff, GIS analysis by DCG/Watershed 2023-2024.

Revised Code of Washington (RCW). (2023) [Revised Code of Washington \(RCW\)](#)

Washington State Department of Commerce (2023) "Guidance for Updating Your Housing Element:
Updating your housing element to address new requirements."
<https://deptofcommerce.app.box.com/s/1d9d517g509r389f0mjpowh8isjpirlh>

DRAFT

Appendix B. Housing Availability and Affordability Analysis



DATE: May 1, 2024
TO: Comprehensive Plan Update Team (including Kitsap County, LDC, Watershed, etc.)
FROM: ECOnorthwest
SUBJECT: Revised Housing Analysis findings, Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan

Introduction

This analysis includes key information to help contextualize and update existing conditions in the housing, economic, and land use elements for the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan periodic update. Kitsap County began the process to update their Comprehensive Plan (last updated in 2016) as a part of the periodic update process, which must be completed by December 2024. The county's guiding principles focus on implementing updates that would support housing and economic development, conserve natural resources, and improve the useability and predictability of the plan. ECO's analytical work provided in this memo (Subtask 2.2) primarily supports housing and economic development goals.


The study area for the analysis focuses on providing results relevant to Kitsap County along with additional details for a selection of sub-county areas. As shown in the map below (Exhibit 1), ECO examined key trends associated with the incorporated cities of Port Orchard, Poulsbo, Bremerton, and Bainbridge Island along with unincorporated urban growth areas in the county, including Silverdale and Kingston.

The term, "Census Designated Places" (CDPs) typically refers to towns, villages, and boroughs that are essentially a concentration of population either legally bounded as an incorporated place or identified as a CDP. This analysis uses CDP boundaries instead of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs, County's urban planning boundaries) for Kingston and Silverdale since the Census Bureau's data products provide detailed data on their characteristics. This map shows the CDP boundaries in grey and the UGA boundaries for Kingston and Silverdale in red. As the map demonstrates, the UGA boundaries for Bainbridge Island, Bremerton, Port Orchard, and Poulsbo are aligned with the CDPs, and the Kingston and Silverdale UGAs have meaningful overlap (providing a solid estimate for trends analysis).



Photo 1. Exhibit 1. Study Area Map, Kitsap County

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Kitsap County. Note: The red outline for the Kingston UGA is slightly obscured by the label.



As shown in the following outline, this memorandum includes five sections and an Appendix providing the following analysis and findings.

Outline

- **Section 1. Community Characteristics.**
 - Population growth
 - Age composition
 - Race/ethnicity
- **Section 2. Household Characteristics.**
 - Household income
 - Household size composition and average rates
 - Household tenure.
- **Section 3. Housing Stock and Market Analysis.**
 - Housing built per year
 - Housing cost trends including median home sales price and rental rates
 - Age of housing
 - Housing vacancy rates for 2-bedroom and 3-bedroom apartments (CoStar)
- **Section 4. Housing Affordability.**
 - Cost burden by household income level
 - The current Area Median Income breakdown describing household income levels.
- **Section 5. Analysis of Racially Disparate Impacts**
 - Homeownership rates by racial and/or ethnicity groups
 - Rates of housing cost burden by racial and/or ethnicity groups
 - Rates of overcrowding (rate of more than one occupant per room) by racial and/or ethnicity groups
 - Housing cost compared to median household income by racial and/or ethnicity groups
 - Concentrations of racial groups
 - Puget Sound Regional Council's Opportunity Mapping and Displacement Risk



- **Section 6. Employment Profile.**
 - Employment growth by industry sector
 - Wage changes
 - Establishment trends
 - Unemployment
 - Industry innovation measurements.

- **Appendix. Construction cost influences and housing affordability Infographic.**

Section 1. Community Characteristics

Population Growth

Kitsap County’s population has grown over the last three decades. In fact, the overall percent change increase from 1990 to 2022 for the County’s population was 48 percent, increasing from nearly 190,000 persons to almost 281,000 persons in 2022 (see Exhibit 2). The overall AAGR for Kitsap County between 1990 and 2022 is 1.2 percent. Recently, between 2010 and 2022, Kitsap County’s population grew at an average annual growth rate (AAGR) of almost one percent (Exhibit 2). This suggests a very small decrease in annual population growth from the previous decade.

As of 2022, the total population in Kitsap County is at 280,900 persons. If the rate of population growth continues at about one percent per year (based on the AAGR from 2010 to 2022), Kitsap County could exceed 300,000 residents by 2030.

Exhibit 2. Population Change Summary, Kitsap County and the State of Washington, 1990–2022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, and the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM). Note: The data reported for years 1990 through 2020 are intercensal estimates; 2021 and 2022 data are postcensal estimates. AAGR = Average Annual Growth Rate, WA = Washington State.


Location	Population Count				Change, 1990 to 2022			Change, 2010 to 2022		
	1990	2000	2010	2022	Difference	% Change	AAGR (%)	Difference	% Change	AAGR (%)
Kitsap County	189,731	231,969	251,133	280,900	91,169	48%	1.2	29,767	12%	0.9
Kingston	No data	1,611	2,099	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
Silverdale	No data	15,816	19,204	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data	No data
WA	4,866,659	5,894,143	6,724,540	7,864,400	2,997,741	62%	1.5	1,139,860	17%	1.3

A look at the year-over-year percent change of population in Exhibit 3 tells a similar story. While the total population has increased between 1990 and 2022, the year-over-year percent change in population has decreased from around four percent in the early 1990s to just one percent from 2019 to 2022.



Exhibit 3. Year over Year Percent Change of Population, Kitsap County, 1990–2022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, and the Washington Office of Financial Management. Note: The data reported for years 1990 through 2020 are intercensal estimates; 2021 and 2022 data are postcensal estimates.




Population Demographics

Kitsap County’s population is primarily composed of older adults. By 2020, more than half of the population is now 45 years old or older (57 percent of the total population) which is much higher than Washington State’s 34 percent for the same age cohort (see Exhibit 4). In total, this is around 23 percent higher than Washington’s 34 percent of people aged 45 and older.

Exhibit 4. Population Distribution of Kitsap County and Washington by Age Category, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Table DP05).



This trend of an aging population can be seen in Kitsap County’s median age statistics, outlined in Exhibit 5. The median age in Kitsap County is 39, which is most similar to Washington’s median age of almost 38 years and Silverdale’s median age of 37.5 years. In comparison, the median age in Bremerton and Port Orchard is lower (32 and 34 years), whereas the median age in Poulsbo, Bainbridge, and Kingston are on the higher end, between 43 and 49 years.

The median age in Kitsap County has increased from 36 years in 2000 to 39 years in 2020, or a growth of about 9 percent. Comparatively, the median age in both Poulsbo, Bainbridge, and Silverdale has increased by 13, 16 and 19 percent respectively within the same timeframe.

Exhibit 5. Median Age Comparisons, Select Cities, Kitsap County, and Washington, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 2 – Table DP1), ACS 5-year estimates, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Table S0101).

Geography	Median Age			Percent Change
	2000	2006-10	2016-20	2000-2020
Bainbridge Island	43.0	45.9	49.7	16%
Bremerton	30.9	31.9	32.4	5%
Port Orchard	31.2	36.3	34.3	10%
Poulsbo	39.3	38.4	44.6	13%
Kingston	41.1	48.9	43.5	6%
Silverdale	31.5	49.5	37.5	19%
Kitsap County	35.8	38.9	39.2	9%
Washington	35.3	37.0	37.8	7%

Kitsap County has become more racially diverse over the last two decades from 2000 to 2020. The shares of all BIPOC populations have increased during this timeframe with the Hispanic/Latino households and Multiracial households increasing the most, comprising almost 9 percent and 8 percent the total population respectively in 2020 (see Exhibit 6 below). While the White population in Kitsap County comprises the largest total share, it has decreased by almost 10 percentage points since 2000 from 82 percent to around 72 percent in 2020 (see Exhibit 6). All other Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC) communities have only increased slightly since 2000.

Kitsap County’s racial demographic composition is similar to the state and other comparison areas shown in Exhibit 7 (below); however, the County is slightly less diverse than the state and Silverdale with the White population comprising a larger total share in 2020 (around 72 percent in the county compared to around 64 percent in Silverdale and the state).¹ Kitsap County’s Hispanic/Latino, Multiracial, and Asian populations encompass the largest percentages of BIPOC communities in the county, whereas Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian/Other/Pacific Islander, and populations defined as “Other” represent less than six percent of the total population in Kitsap County.

¹ Kitsap County has a smaller share of Asian and Hispanic/Latino households compared to the Washington state and Silverdale populations



Exhibit 6. Change in Diversity, Kitsap County, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Table P007) and 2020 ACS 5-year estimates (Table B03002).




Photo 2.

Photo 3.

Photo 4.


Photo 5.

Photo 6.

Photo 7.

Exhibit 7. Distribution of Population by Race and Ethnicity, Kitsap County, Washington, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2020 Decennial Census Redistricting Data (PL 94-171) estimates (Table P2).



Factors Affecting Housing Demand

Housing demand is determined by the preferences for different types of housing available (e.g., single-family detached or apartment), and the ability to pay for that housing (the ability to exercise those preferences in a housing market by purchasing or renting housing). Preferences for housing are related to demographic characteristics and changes (such as household size changes) in addition to personal preferences. The ability to pay for housing is dependent on housing costs (including utility payments) and household income and other sources of cost reductions (such as a roommate paying rent) or liquid assets available to pay for housing.

This section focuses on demographic factors to assess how changes and recent trends may affect the housing need in Kitsap County through the next two decades. The location of housing, whether it is available for purchase or rent, and many demographic and socioeconomic variables affect housing choice. **Studies about housing markets indicate that the age of the householder, size of the household, and income are most strongly correlated with housing choice.**²

- **Age of householder** is the age of the person identified (in the Census) as the head of household. Households make different housing choices at different stages of life. Generational trends, such as housing preferences of Baby Boomers (people born from about 1946 to 1964) and Millennials (people born from about 1980 to 2000) are discussed below but in general, homeownership rates increase as age increases.
- **Size of household** (or the number of people living in the household). Younger and older people are more likely to live in single-person households. People in their middle years are more likely to live in multiple person households (often with children). Between 2000 and 2021, Kitsap County's average household size decreased from 2.60 persons per household down to 2.52 in 2021 (a three percent contraction).³ While not a large decline, the stagnation in the countywide average household size can be partially explained by the growth in non-family households (e.g., persons living alone or with roommates). From 2000 to 2021, the number of non-family households in Kitsap County increased by about 36 percent compared to the growth of family households by 18 percent.⁴ In 2021, single-person households comprised nearly one-quarter (24.2 percent) of all Kitsap County households—up 1.6 percentage points from 2000 (22.6 percent).⁵ As the county's population has aged, adult children forming separate households from their parent or parents reduces household size on two ends: those new households are usually one- or two- person households, while the parent or parents are heads of a smaller remaining household.

² Source: Clark, W, and Deileman, F. (2017). *Households and Housing*. Routledge, New York, New York.

³ Data estimates are based on 2000 Decennial Census estimates and ACS 2021 1-year estimates. The data referenced were retrieved from Table H012: Average Household Size of Occupied Housing Units by Tenure (2000 Census, Summary File 1) and Table S1101: Households and Families (2021 ACS data, 1-year estimates).

⁴ Data estimates are based on 2000 Decennial Census estimates and ACS 2021 1-year estimates. The data referenced were retrieved from Table P014: Household Type by Household Size (2000 Census, Summary File 3) and Table B11016: Household Type by Household Size (2021 ACS data, 1-year estimates).

⁵ *Ibid.*




- Household income.** Income is probably the most important determinant of housing choice for all age categories. Income is strongly related to the type of housing a household chooses (e.g., townhome, stand-alone single-family home, or apartment complex) as well as household tenure (e.g., rent or own). Homeownership rates increase as income increases and renters (particularly with smaller households) are more likely to live in multifamily housing.

An individual's housing needs change throughout their life, with changes in income, family composition, and age. The type of housing needed by a twenty-year-old college student differs from the needs of a forty-year-old parent with children, or an eighty-year-old single adult. As Kitsap County's population ages, different types of housing will be needed to accommodate older residents. This cycle of changing housing needs by age is depicted in Exhibit 8. **The illustration below shows how a young or older couple and single parent family tend to seek out middle housing (a triplex is shown on the right) while a large family with two or more children tends to seek out single-detached housing (shown on the left).**

Exhibit 8. Illustration of Diverse Household Needs Throughout Time

Sources: ECONorthwest, adapted from Clark, William A. V. and Frans M. Dieleman. 1996.



As previously discussed, the median age in Kitsap County increased from 36 years in 2000 to 39 years in 2020 (see Exhibit 5). Thus, Kitsap County’s population is growing older, increasing the need for housing suited to older adults. Addressing housing needs for those aged above 60 will require a range of housing opportunities. For example, “the 82-to-86-year-old cohort dominates the assisted living and more intensive care sector”, while new or near-retirees may prefer aging in place or active, age-targeted communities.⁶ Characteristics like immigration and ethnicity play a role too as “older Asians and Hispanics are more likely than whites or [B]lacks to live in multigenerational households.”⁷

Households for adults 65 years or older tend to retire, switching to a fixed income that might lead to different living circumstances. For instance, low-income households may not have the financial resources to live out their years in a nursing home and may instead choose to downsize to smaller, more affordable units. Others living near relatives may also choose to live in multigenerational households or in accessory dwelling units. The aging of the Baby Boomer generation could increase the demand for smaller “downsized” housing (suitable for small households), greater demand for housing with assistance and age-in-place amenities, increased demand for low-maintenance housing and multigenerational housing, and higher demand for more affordable housing due to fixed incomes.

⁶ Source: Urban Land Institute (2018). Emerging Trends in Real Estate, United States and Canada.

⁷ Source: Herbert, Christopher and Hrabchak Molinsky (2015). Meeting the Housing Needs of an Aging Population. https://shelterforce.org/2015/05/30/meeting_the_housing_needs_of_an_aging_population/



Section 2. Household Characteristics

Household Income Trends

In Kitsap County, the median household income has been gradually increasing over the last ten years. As shown below, the share of households earning over \$150,000 increased from 9 percent in 2010 to 17 percent in 2020, and the share of households earning \$100-\$149,000 increased from 15 percent to 20 percent. Households earning less than \$75,000 decreased from 62 percent to 47 percent by 2020.

Exhibit 9. Household Income Distribution of Kitsap County, 2010–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Table B19001).




Exhibit 10 shows the median household income changes over the last twenty years for Kitsap County, Kingston, and Silverdale. In Kitsap County, median household incomes (on an inflation-adjusted basis) have increased from \$70,399 to \$78,969, which is a 12 percent increase.

While this increase matches that of Washington, it is two percent lower than Silverdale's increase in median household income, which went from \$71,362 in 2000 to \$81,458 in 2020. Furthermore, Kitsap County's percent change in median household income is 14 percent lower than that of Kingston, where the median household income increased from \$62,028 to \$77,008 in the same timeframe. The Kingston area in northern Kitsap County has experienced the highest increase in median household income from 2000-2020, with a 26 percent increase to \$77,008 in 2020.

Exhibit 10. Change in Median Household Income for Kingston, Silverdale, Kitsap County, and Washington, 2020 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 3 – Table HCT012) and ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Table B19013). Dollar amounts for 2000 and 2010 were adjusted for inflation using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers and All Items (annual, not seasonally adjusted values).

Median Household Income (2020 Dollars)	2000	2010	2020	Percent Change, 2000–2020
Kingston	\$61,028	\$62,579	\$77,008	26.2%
Silverdale	\$71,362	\$72,044	\$81,458	14.1%
Kitsap County	\$70,399	\$70,679	\$78,969	12.2%
Washington	\$68,800	\$67,943	\$77,006	11.9%

As shown below, the household income distribution in Kitsap County and Washington for 2020 are quite similar (Exhibit 11). For both regions, about 37 percent of households earned over \$100,000, while about 62 percent earned less than that.

Exhibit 11. Household Income Distribution of Kitsap County and Washington, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Table B19001).





Exhibit 12 (below) shows that Kitsap County’s household income distribution varies among age groups. Adults 25 years of age and younger tended to have lower levels of income relative to older working-age adults. About 55 percent of adults 25 and younger earned less than \$50,000 annually in 2020 compared to 18 percent for 25-to-44-year-olds and 25 percent for 45-to-64-year-olds. Conversely, 27 percent of 25-to-44-year-olds and 33 percent of 45-to-64-year-olds earned



over \$150,000 annually, while no adult households under 25 years of age earned above \$150,000. Senior households had the most evenly distributed income relative to all other age groups, likely due to seniors being on fixed incomes. About 37 percent of seniors earned less than \$50,000 annually and about 12 percent earned over \$150,000 annually.

Exhibit 12. Household Income Distribution of Kitsap County Residents by Age Category, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-Year Estimates, Table B19037 (2020).




Household Tenure and Composition

Kitsap County has maintained its homeownership levels even in the face of a small state-wide decrease in household ownership. Exhibit 13 shows that the share of owner households in Kitsap County has increased between 2000 and 2020 by one percentage point (from 67 to 68 percent), while the share of owner households decreased by two percentage points statewide (65 percent down to 63 percent).

Exhibit 13. Household Tenure, Kitsap County, WA, 2000–2020


Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 2 – Table DP1) and ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Table DP04).



Similar to Washington, most Kitsap County households were owners between 2000 and 2020, at about 67-68 percent. The respective shares of rental and owner households have remained stable across the years.

Exhibit 14. Household Tenure, Kingston, Silverdale, Kitsap County and Washington, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Table DP04).



In 2020, Kitsap County’s share of owner-occupied households, at 68 percent, was similar to the state as a whole, at 63 percent. Two of the county’s urban growth areas, Kingston, and Silverdale, provide a larger share of rental opportunities (42 and 49 percent respectively) in comparison to the county and state. Silverdale has the highest share of households renting, which is to be expected given recent multifamily housing construction.



Kitsap County’s household tenure shares across household size have remained relatively consistent between 2000 and 2020. Although the share of renters and owners for one and two person households have increased in 2020, indicating a trend towards smaller overall household sizes, particularly for renters. For two-person households, the share of renters increased from 28 to 33 percent, while the share of renters for three-person households decreased by two percent (see Exhibit 15 below). For owner-occupied housing, the share of one and two-person households both increased in 2020 by a few percentage points from 18 to 20 percent for one-person households and from 39 to 42 percent for two-person households.

Exhibit 15. Household Tenure by Household Size, Kitsap County, 2000 and 2020

Source: US Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census, Table H015 (Summary File 1); and 2020 ACS 5-year estimates, Table B25009.




Exhibit 16. Shares of Household Ownership by Age of Householder, Kitsap County, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (summary File 4 – Table HCT003) and ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Table B25007).

Age of Homeowner	2000	2020	Change, 2000-2020
15 to 34 years	10.3%	11.4%	1.1
35 to 44 years	23.6%	13.9%	(9.6)
45 to 54 years	28.1%	16.7%	(11.4)
55 to 64 years	17.1%	24.1%	7.1
65 to 74 years	11.2%	21.5%	10.3
75 and older	9.7%	12.3%	2.6
Total	100.0%	100.0%	0.0

Householders aged 55 to 64 represent the highest share of homeownership in Kitsap County (24 percent), and their rates of homeownership have increased the second fastest by age cohort, by about 7 percentage points, between 2000 and 2020. On the other hand, the share of homeowners aged 45 to 54 has decreased by about 11 percentage points from 2000 to 2020, and those aged 35 to 44 have decreased their share of homeownership by nearly 10 percentage points over the

same timeframe. At the same time, homeowners aged 15 to 34 only grew by about one percentage point during the analysis period. **This suggests that younger and middle-aged households in Kitsap County are struggling to obtain homeownership at the same rates as more senior households.**

Similar to Washington State, most households in Kitsap County are composed of married couples with or without children, at 53 percent in 2020 (Exhibit 18). Married couple households with or without children have decreased by five percent since 2000, while in contrast, single-parent, and non-family households have all increased slightly over the same timeframe.

Average household size is quite similar among the regions of Washington State, Kitsap County, Kingston, and Silverdale, ranging between 2.37 and 2.53 people per household. Kitsap County’s average household size of 2.46 people sits right in the middle of this range, as does Silverdale. Given what we know about Kitsap County’s household composition, these households are mostly comprised of married couple families (53.3 percent) and non-family households (32.5 percent). Single parent households represent about 14.2 percent of Kitsap County’s households.

Exhibit 17. Average Household Size, Washington, Kitsap County, Kingston, and Silverdale, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Table S1101).

	Washington	Kitsap County	Kingston	Silverdale
Average household size	2.53	2.46	2.37	2.47



Exhibit 18. Household Composition, Kitsap County and Washington, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 2 – Table DP1) and ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Table DP04). Note on U.S. Census Data: Non-family households include single persons living alone along with unrelated persons living together. Single-male families includes families with a male householder with a family but no partner present. Single-female families includes families with a female householder with a family but no partner present. A married couple is two adults enumerated as members of the same household. The married couple may or may not have children living with them.





Exhibit 19. Married-Couple Family Households with Children Kitsap County and Washington, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File 2 – Table DP1) and ACS 5-year estimates (Table S1101).



In Kitsap County, the share of households that are married-couple family households with children is decreasing faster than that of the state. Exhibit 19 shows that between 2000 and 2020, Kitsap County’s share of family households has decreased by 12 percent, from 47 percent to 35 percent. In comparison, the state’s share of family households has decreased by six percent less over the same time.

Section 3. Housing Market Analysis

Housing Unit Supply and Production Data Analysis Findings

According to OFM data analyzed in Exhibit 20, housing availability in Kitsap County has become increasingly limited. While the year-over-year percent change in housing units has started to pick up since 2010, it has only increased by an average annual rate of around 0.6 percent through 2020 (see Exhibit 21). Total housing units in Kitsap County have increased from 107,367 in 2010 up to 115,443 in 2022, which is about 807 new units per year on average for the County.

The lower average annual growth rate of 0.6 percent over the last decade (from 2010 to 2022) represents a relative decrease from the county's previous decade, where housing units increased by about 1.5 percent per year over the 2000 to 2010 period (or, about 1,472 new units built per year). This decline could partially be related to slow recovery from the Great Recession beginning around 2007. In comparison, Washington State slightly exceeded Kitsap County's rate of adding new housing units over the last decade by adding new housing units at a rate of 1.6 percent per year on average (compared to Kitsap County's 1.5 percent), and over the 2010 to 2022 period, Washington added new units at a rate of 1.4 percent per year compared to the County's 0.6 percent.


Exhibit 20. Annual Housing Growth: Total Housing Units in Kitsap County and Annual Percent Change, 1992–2022

Source: Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM).



Exhibit 21. Annual Change of Housing, Kitsap County Compared to Washington, 1991–2022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, and the Washington Office of Financial Management. Note: The data reported for years 1990 through 2020 are intercensal estimates; 2021 and 2022 data are postcensal estimates.




Rents Compared to Affordability

Rents have increased considerably in Kitsap County since 2000. As of July 2022, the average rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Kitsap County was \$1,940, which is about 117 percent higher than the rent for a two-bedroom apartment in 2000 (see Exhibit 22 below).

Exhibit 22. Average Market and Fair Market Rents for a 2-bedroom Apartment, 2000–2022

Sources: CoStar (historical rent data) and HUD (MF 2-Bed affordability data). Notes: Two-bedroom affordable rents are fair market rents reported by HUD. These are on a fiscal year basis. The average monthly rent values were not adjusted for inflation since it was not recommended to adjust rent or home sales prices for inflation. For this analysis, 0-30% is very low income, 31-50% is low income, and 51-80% is moderate income. MFI stands for Median Family Income.



Overall, average rents have more than doubled in Kitsap County over the last two decades, increasing from nearly \$900 in 2000 to almost \$2k in 2022. As of 2022, Kitsap County’s average rent is similar to the cities of Poulsbo (\$1,933) and Port Orchard (\$1,840), as seen in Exhibit 23. However, it is higher than the Bremerton and Port Orchard average rents and around \$600 lower than Bainbridge Island’s average rent of \$2,605. In comparison to these areas, Kitsap County’s average growth rate is quite similar (aside from Bainbridge Island, which has an AAGR of 2.6 percent).

Exhibit 23. Average Asking 2-bedroom Rent in Bainbridge Island and Kitsap County 2000–2022

Source: CoStar. AAGR: Average Annual Growth Rate.

Geography	2000	2010	2020	2022	Percent Change 2000–2022	AAGR, 2000–2022
Bainbridge Island	\$1,484	\$1,662	\$2,377	\$2,605	75.5%	2.6%
Bremerton	\$859	\$1,007	\$1,541	\$1,768	105.8%	3.3%
Port Orchard	\$954	\$1,100	\$1,592	\$1,840	92.9%	3.7%
Poulsbo	\$876	\$984	\$1,678	\$1,933	120.7%	3.7%
Kitsap County	\$894	\$1,055	\$1,622	\$1,940	117.0%	3.6%




Another useful measure of housing supply and demand are the vacancy rates of different housing product types. Housing vacancy is a measure of housing that is available to prospective renters and buyers (in some cases) and can help measure unutilized housing stock. A housing vacancy rate is typically described as the percent of units that are unoccupied. Low vacancy rates may indicate a limited housing supply and inadequate housing production to satisfy demand, while in contrast, high vacancy rates imply an over-supply of housing, reduced desirability of an area, or low demand. Housing market assessments often use five to ten percent as a standard vacancy rate since it implies a balance between housing supply and demand.⁸ Average rental housing vacancy rates tend to fluctuate roughly between six and eight percent in the United States from 2015 to 2022.⁹

Vacancy rates for 2- and 3-bedroom apartments (primarily serving as rentals) have fluctuated over the past couple decades. The vacancy rate of 2-bedroom apartments reached a relative low of 4.5 percent in 2021 (similar to its vacancy rates in 2000); however, as of October 2022, 2-bedroom vacancies grew to 7.3 percent (similar to its 2009 and 2012 vacancy rates). While 3-bedroom vacancies generally followed the trends of 2-bedroom vacancies, in 2021, 3-bedroom vacancies reached 8.4 percent (3.9 percentage points higher than 2-bedroom vacancies that year), the highest rate over the analysis period.

Exhibit 24. Vacancy Rate of 2- and 3-bedroom Multifamily Units in Kitsap County, 2000–2022

Source: CoStar.




⁸ Sources: Hagen, Daniel A. and Julia L. Hansen. (2010). "Rental Housing and the Natural Vacancy Rate." *Journal of Real Estate Research*, April 2010. Pages 413-434. Azibo. (2023). Retrieved at this [link](#).

⁹ Source: U.S. Census. (2023). Retrieved at: <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2022/05/housing-vacancy-rates-near-historic-lows.html>

The median sales price of homes has simultaneously increased over the past decade. In the month of June 2022, Kitsap County’s median home sale value was \$600,000 (see Exhibit 25), 140 percent higher than its median home sale value of \$250,000 in June 2012. Comparatively, Bainbridge Island’s median sales price of single-family homes reached just over \$1.5 million in June 2022, 188 percent higher than its median sales price in June 2012. Port Orchard’s median home sales price increased by 165 percent (from \$215,000 in June 2012 up to \$570,000 in June 2022), Poulsbo’s increased by 113 percent (from \$308,000 up to \$655,500), and Bremerton’s grew by 183 percent (from \$178,500 up to \$505,000).

Exhibit 25. Median Monthly Home Sales Price, Comparison to Kitsap County, including Port Orchard, Poulsbo, Bainbridge Island, and Bremerton, February 2012 – June 2022

Source: Redfin Data Center.



The sizable growth rate in home sale prices in Kitsap County is due, in part, to the high demand for housing coupled with the county’s declining stock of homes available on the market and increasing construction costs.


Exhibit 26, provided below, shows the monthly change in homes for sale in Kitsap County’s real estate market). **Similar to Port Orchard, Poulsbo, Bremerton, and Bainbridge, the supply of homes for sale in Kitsap County has been gradually declining since 2012.** Among all the cities included in this exhibit, Bainbridge Island and Poulsbo had the smallest supply of homes for sale consistently from February 2012 to February 2022. Their supply of homes for sale has dipped below 100 homes since 2020. The pandemic could influence home sale trends due to a



decreased supply of housing being built, construction cost changes and building supply limitations, and labor shortages (see the Appendix for construction cost changes information).

Exhibit 26. Homes for Sale in Kitsap County, Compared to Bremerton, Bainbridge Island, Port Orchard, and Poulsbo, February 2012 – June 2022

Source: Redfin Data Center.




Below, Exhibit 27 compares Kitsap County’s median home sales value to the cities of Bainbridge, Port Orchard, Poulsbo Bellevue, Edmonds, Gig Harbor, Redmond, and University Place. These cities were chosen to provide additional comparison communities within the broader Puget Sound region.

Among all regions, Kitsap County had the lowest median sales price in June 2022. Compared to nearby King County and the various cities shown below, Kitsap’s home sales prices are lower (still below \$600k in 2022), which provides a comparative advantage for those looking to live in the region but not able to afford the higher home sales prices.

Exhibit 27. Median Monthly Home Sales Price, Kitsap County Compared to King County, Bellevue, Edmonds, Gig Harbor, Redmond, Bainbridge Island, University Place, February 2012 – June 2022

Source: Redfin Data Center.



The median sales price in Kitsap County reached a high of just over one million dollars in April of 2022. In the years prior, the median home sales price changes were smaller.

The pandemic could influence housing market dynamics and home sale trends due to a decreased supply of housing being built, construction cost changes and building supply limitations, and labor shortages. Changes associated with work-from-home trends should also be considered. Consequently, it would be helpful to reassess in later years to determine the extent of the impact of these trends and how the market adjusted. Overall, Kitsap County had a lower median sales price than King County, as well as the cities of Bainbridge, Bellevue, Edmonds, Gig Harbor, Redmond, and University Place, from 2012 to 2022.


Exhibit 28, below, shows the age of single-family homes across Kitsap County. The map demonstrates Port Orchard’s recent single-family developments and the single-family housing built before 1980 near Port Orchard and Bremerton. The age of housing does not always align with housing conditions, but older housing that has not been remodeled or maintained appropriately might need redevelopment, upgrades, and possible additional investment. Also, the cost of maintaining housing can lead to financial burden particularly for those with lower incomes to draw from, and this delayed maintenance may lead to serious housing problems.



The unexpected costs of repairs are often unaffordable, sometimes leading to people moving to other housing and/or switching their housing tenure to rent rather than own.

Exhibit 28. Age of Housing, Kitsap County

Source: Kitsap County Assessor 2019.



Housing Permits in Kitsap County


Kitsap County permit data was analyzed to show recent housing type develop trends from 2012 to 2022 in Kitsap County (see Exhibit 29, Exhibit 30, and Exhibit 31). Housing permit data were

tabulated by issuance year and housing type for Kingston, Silverdale, and unincorporated Kitsap County, as a whole.¹⁰ The summary below describes the total number of housing units permitted, disaggregated by general housing type.¹¹

In total, 4,090 housing units were permitted in the unincorporated areas of Kitsap County from 2012 to December 1, 2022 (see Exhibit 29 below). About 81 percent of the total permitted units were single-family detached residential units. Multifamily units (5 or more units) made up the second largest share at 7.5 percent, followed by manufactured and mobile home units (5.1 percent of total), duplexes (2.9 percent), ADUs (2.4 percent), and townhouses (1.1 percent). In 2022, Kitsap County issued its largest volume of permitted units in its unincorporated areas, reaching 695 total units as of December 1, 2022. This is largely due to the 222 units in multifamily permits issued in 2022. These multifamily units pertain to two properties, Fieldstone on Clear Creek (114 assisted living apartment units located in Silverdale) and McWilliam Apartments (108 units located in the Central Kitsap UGA).

Exhibit 29. Housing Units Permitted in Unincorporated Kitsap County, 2012–2022

Source: Kitsap County, Unincorporated Kitsap County Residential Permits Issued.



¹⁰ The housing permit data from Kitsap County might not fully account for new housing units recently developed in the county area. According to CoStar, 226 multifamily units are being actively constructed in the Silverdale area. One of these properties (78 units) began construction in December 2020 and the other (148 units) in March 2022. These properties have not been added to permit database yet.


¹¹ Note that housing units permitted differs from housing permits. Every housing permit has an associated number of housing units. For example, a single-family home permit typically has one housing unit. In the case of a multifamily property, there might be one permit representing 50 units. In this analysis, ECONorthwest summarized the total permitted units associated with each housing permit.



In both the UGA and Census Designated Place (CDP) boundaries of Kingston, 201 total housing units were permitted during the 2012 to 2022 period. Approximately 58 percent of Kingston’s permitted units were for single-family detached homes—about 23 percentage points lower than the unincorporated County’s 81 percent. In 2022, 47 townhome units were permitted in Kingston, which accounted for about 23 percent of Kingston’s total permitted units during the analysis period.

Exhibit 30. Housing Units Permitted in Kingston, 2012–2022

Source: Kitsap County, Unincorporated Kitsap County Residential Permits Issued.




Like Kingston, most permitted housing units in the Silverdale Census Designated Place (CDP) and Urban Growth Area (UGA) were for single-family homes (about 70 percent of all units compared to the unincorporated countywide average of 81 percent).

Silverdale, however, differs from Kingston in its permitted duplex units. No duplex units were permitted in Kingston during the analysis period, whereas in Silverdale, 88 duplex units were permitted. These duplex units accounted for approximately 12 percent of Silverdale’s total permitted housing units from 2012 to 2022, and 73 percent of the unincorporated County’s total permitted duplex units. The remaining permitted units in Silverdale consisted of multifamily units (16 percent of total units), ADUs (one percent), and mobile homes (0.4 percent). Although the full year of 2022 permit data was not available at the time of analysis, Silverdale’s highest volume of permitted units occurred in 2022 relative to prior years analyzed at nearly 33 percent. In fact, nearly 50 percent of Silverdale’s permitted units occurred in 2021 and 2022 alone out of the 2012 to 2022 time period of this permit data analysis.

Exhibit 31. Housing Units Permitted in Silverdale, 2012–2022


Source: Kitsap County Assessor, Unincorporated Kitsap County Residential Permits Issued.



Slightly over half of the housing units permitted (51 percent) were issued across the county in unincorporated areas outside of urban growth areas and rural centers (LAMIRD)¹² from 2012 to 2022. The second largest share of housing units permitted occurred in the Silverdale Census Designated Place (CDP) and Urban Growth Area with 17.2 percent of total units, followed by the Central Kitsap UGA (12.6 percent), the Port Orchard UGA (6.5 percent), the Kingston CDP and UGA (4.9 percent), the Bremerton East and West UGAs (4.6 percent), and then the Keyport, Manchester, and Suquamish LAMIRDs with a combined 2.8 percent of total permitted units. The lowest share of units permitted over the last decade occurred in the Poulsbo UGA with only 3 units (or 0.1 percent of the unincorporated County’s total units permitted during the analysis period).

Exhibit 32. Housing Units Permitted by Unincorporated Kitsap County Area, 2012–2022

Source: Kitsap County Assessor, Unincorporated Kitsap County Residential Permits Issued.



On an average annual basis, the unincorporated areas of Kitsap County had the largest volume of units permitted at 191 units per year (see Exhibit 33). The Silverdale CDP had the second highest average annual units permitted at 64 units per year, followed by the Central

¹² Limited Area of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRD): Rural areas within Kitsap County that contain intensive levels of commercial and residential development (e.g., having a relatively dense commercial zone that supports its residents and tourists passing through), but are not officially incorporated as cities. According to Kitsap County’s General Ordinances, Chapter 17.360A-E, there are five LAMIRD’s within Kitsap County. The pertinent chapters that pertain to the LAMIRD permit data analyzed in this report are: Keyport Rural Village (17.360A), Manchester Rural Village (17.360B), and the Suquamish Rural Village (17.360D).

Kitsap UGA (47 permitted units per year), the Port Orchard UGA (24 permitted units per year), and the Kingston CDP (18 permitted units per year).

Exhibit 33. Total Permitted Housing Units and Average Annual Units Permitted by Unincorporated Kitsap County Area, 2012–2022

Source: Kitsap County Assessor, Unincorporated Kitsap County Residential Permits Issued.

Geography / Area	Total Housing Units Permitted	Average Annual Housing Units Permitted
Kingston CDP + UGA	201	18
Silverdale CDP + UGA	705	64
Bremerton UGAs	187	17
Central Kitsap UGA	514	47
Port Orchard UGA	264	24
Poulsbo UGA	3	0.3
Keyport, Manchester, and Suquamish LAMIRDS	116	11
Unincorporated Kitsap County	2,100	191
Total	4,090	372



Section 4. Housing Affordability

Housing Affordability

This section provides information useful for comprehending housing affordability and how it impacts or burdens households and the broader community. Housing costs are typically the largest portion of a household budget. “Housing costs” typically include mortgage or rent payment, utilities, interest, and insurance. The term affordable housing refers to a household’s ability to find housing within its financial means. The typical standard used to determine housing affordability is that a household should pay no more than 30 percent of household income for housing, including payments and interest or rent, utilities, and insurance.¹³ This household affordability assumption is often used to help estimate whether a household is paying more than what they can afford for housing.

Cost Burden

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines indicate that a household is cost burdened when they pay more than 30 percent of their gross household income for housing and severely cost burdened when they pay more than 50 percent of their gross household income for housing.

Housing cost burden can put households in vulnerable situations and force them to make trade-offs between housing costs and other essentials like food, medicine, or transportation. This unstable condition can also lead to rental evictions, job instability, school instability for children, and homelessness. Since housing at the low-income cost range is rare, most households in this income range have to pay more than 30% of their income for their housing.¹⁴ Low-income households who are severely cost burdened are at high risk of homelessness if a household crisis emerges.

Cost burden for owner-occupied households is not terribly common because mortgage lenders typically ensure that a household can pay its debt obligations before approving a loan. However, cost burdening can occur when a household secures a mortgage and then sees its income decline. In addition, retired persons subsisting on a fixed income can experience cost burden associated with increased property taxes rising above their financial limitations.¹⁵

¹³ US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). (2022). Retrieved at: <https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2022/12/housing-costs-burden.html>


¹⁴ The exact definition of low-income households varies slightly between different jurisdictions. Generally Housing Kitsap defines very low-income as below 50% of the AMI and low-income as 50 to 80% of the AMI. Retrieved at this [link](#).

¹⁵ Also, it is important to note that households with incomes over 100 percent of the AMI are less burdened overall since their larger income, minus housing costs, will go farther to cover non-housing expenses such as transportation, childcare, and food. While cost burden is a common measure of housing affordability, it does have limitations. The measure does not consider the actual income and the possibility of higher incomes being able to

Unsurprisingly, renter households tend to be more cost burdened than owner households in Kitsap County. As of 2020, 18 percent of renter households were cost burdened, compared to 16 percent of owner households. Renters in Kitsap County also tended to be more severely cost burdened in 2020 with 30 percent severely cost burdened in comparison to only 8 percent of owner households being severely cost burdened. Renters are more likely to be cost burdened than homeowners because most renters tend to be lower income and in a place like Kitsap County, renters are left with a small supply of housing options available to rent.

Exhibit 34. Share of Cost Burden by Tenure in Kitsap County, 2000–2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Decennial Census (Summary File X – Tables H069 and H090) and ACS 5-year data, 2006-10 and 2016-20 estimates (Tables B25070 and B25091).



Overall, cost burden for renters in Kitsap County has increased between 2000 and 2020, from 42 percent to 48 percent. Across the years, cost burden and severe cost burden has consistently been higher for renters than for owners. As shown below, Kitsap County and Washington State had very similar shares of cost burdened and severely cost burdened renter and owner households in 2020 (Exhibit 35).

easily pay for necessary nondiscretionary expenses with the remaining income and it does not account for accumulated wealth and assets (such as profits from selling another house) that allow them to purchase a house that would be considered unaffordable to them based on the cost-burden indicator.



Exhibit 35. Cost Burdened Comparison by Tenure, Kitsap County and Washington, 2020

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 5-year data, 2016-20 estimates (Tables B25070 and B25091).





Exhibit 36. Share of income spent on housing & transportation, 2019

Source: CNT H+T Index Data, 2019. Note: Estimates for the City of Vancouver and Seattle, WA are provided below as a comparison.



While the most currently available Housing and Transportation (H+T) Affordability Index data is relatively old at the time of this report's writing, its usefulness is in its ability to account for transportation costs as an additive measure to the housing cost burdening calculation. In 2019, Kitsap County residents earning 80 percent AMI spent 33 percent of their annual income on housing costs, with an additional 24 percent spent on transportation, for a total household

income burden of 57 percent.¹⁶ Kitsap County’s housing and transportation costs are similar to the City of Vancouver, but the county’s housing cost burden is lower than that of the City of Seattle, where residents earning 80 percent AMI spent 38 percent of their annual income on housing.

For context, the Median Family Income (MFI) for a four-person household in Kitsap County is \$51,450 at 50 percent of MFI, \$82,300 at 80 percent MFI, and \$102,500 at 100 percent MFI (see Exhibit 37).

Exhibit 37. HUD Household Income limits by family size, 2022

Sources: HUD Income Limits for Bremerton-Silverdale MSA (Kitsap County), FY 2022.

Area Median Income Limits, Fiscal Year 2022							
Persons in Family	50% of MFI	80% of MFI	100% of MFI	120% of MFI	150% of MFI	180% of MFI	200% of MFI
1	\$36,050	\$57,650	\$72,060	\$86,470	\$108,090	\$129,710	\$144,120
2	\$41,200	\$65,850	\$82,130	\$98,770	\$123,470	\$148,160	\$164,620
3	\$46,350	\$74,100	\$92,630	\$111,160	\$138,950	\$166,730	\$185,260
4	\$51,450	\$82,300	\$102,500	\$123,000	\$153,750	\$184,500	\$205,000
5	\$55,600	\$88,900	\$111,130	\$133,360	\$166,700	\$200,030	\$222,260
6	\$59,700	\$95,500	\$119,380	\$143,260	\$179,070	\$214,880	\$238,760
7	\$63,800	\$102,100	\$127,630	\$153,160	\$191,450	\$229,730	\$255,260
8	\$67,950	\$109,650	\$137,060	\$164,470	\$205,590	\$246,710	\$274,120

¹⁶ Another way to comprehend housing affordability is to look at how much each income level can afford in housing costs. Each year, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) uses data from the US Census to define an area’s Median Family Income (MFI) based on family size (2022 values are provided). The MFI benchmark helps determine eligibility for HUD housing programs (often including rent-restricted housing) and supports the tracking of different housing needs for a range of household incomes. Kitsap County falls within the Bremerton-Silverdale Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) which has a 100% MFI of \$102,500 per year for a family of four in 2022. The term Area Median Income tends to be used more generally in the industry than MFI. If the term Area Median Income (AMI) is used in an unqualified manor, this reference is synonymous with HUD’s MFI.



Section 5. Analysis of Racially Disparate Impacts


The following section includes analysis helpful for describing potential disparate impacts associated with the access to needed affordable housing, especially impacting Communities of Color. This section provides information useful for developing or revising housing element policies focused on ameliorating racially disparate impacts, exclusion, and housing displacement. Homeownership rates, rates of cost burden, rates of overcrowded housing, and household median income were analyzed for different races/ethnicities to help identify possible disparities. In addition, mapping using the Puget Sound Regional Council's Opportunity Mapping and Displacement Risk data was analyzed to determine where there are areas in Kitsap County that might have a higher risk of displacement. This displacement risk information helps inform planning and the implementation of measures protecting households impacted by displacement.

In the analysis below, the margins of error are provided where possible for estimates separated by race and ethnicity. These error bounds are based on a 90 percent confidence interval. This margin of error information helps determine where the data was too limited and unreliable (often due to a small sample size).

The exhibit below visualizes the homeownership rates for different races and ethnicities. The results show much lower rates of homeownership among Black (34 percent), Hispanic (54 percent), and Other Race households (36 percent) in 2022. This indicates potential racial disparities associated with homeownership. The share of White (73 percent) and Asian households (71 percent) owning their homes is roughly double the share of Black households.

Exhibit 38. Homeownership rates by race and ethnicity, 2022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS PUMS 5-year data, 2018-22.




Additional analysis of cost burdened households is provided to show trends among different races/ethnicities. As mentioned earlier, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) guidelines indicate that a household is cost burdened when they pay more than 30 percent of their gross household income for housing and severely cost burdened when they pay more than 50 percent of their gross household income for housing. Housing cost burden can put households in vulnerable situations and force them to make trade-offs between housing costs and other essentials like food, medicine, or transportation. This unstable condition can also lead to rental evictions, job and school instability, and homelessness.

Exhibit 39 indicates that renters (in 2022) often had a higher share of cost burden rates compared to households in owner-occupied housing. Further analysis of cost burdened renters shows potential racial disparities in the access to affordable housing. Among renter households, the highest cost burdened rates were for Black with 44 percent cost burdened and 12 percent severely cost burdened; Other Races with 34 percent cost burdened and 23 percent severely cost burdened; Hispanic with 19 percent cost burdened and 26 percent severely cost burdened; and Asian with 32 percent cost burdened and 8 percent severely cost burdened.

Exhibit 39. Housing cost burden by race and ethnicity, 2022



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS PUMS 5-year data, 2018-22.




In addition, the project team examined rates of overcrowded housing conditions where a household exceeds the capacity of the bedrooms in a home. Overcrowded housing conditions could indicate a mismatch between the housing available and the needs of the household. Whether a household is truly “crowded” depends on the number of people sharing the dwelling, their relationship, and conditions of the home (such as uninhabitable conditions). For example, two adults sharing one bedroom might not be considered crowding if they are in a relationship preferring that a bedroom be shared.

The analysis provided below (Exhibit 40) examines overcrowding among different races/ethnicities to help identify potential disparities. Among the groups analyzed, the Other Races (includes Mixed Race households) and Hispanic households had the highest incidences of overcrowding in Kitsap County. Around 5 percent of Mixed Race households had over 3 persons per bedroom in 2022. Approximately 9 to 11 percent of Mixed Race and Hispanic households had between 2 and 3 persons per bedroom. These high rates of overcrowding could be a consequence of unmet housing needs and could indicate the lack of available affordable housing, particularly available to larger households (such as multigenerational households).

Exhibit 40. Rates of overcrowding by race and ethnicity, 2022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS PUMS 5-year data, 2018-22.



Evaluating the cost of housing compared to median household income can help provide insights where housing costs are above what a household could afford. The analysis provided below (Exhibit 42) shows findings for different race and ethnic groups to help identify racial disparities. The US Department of Housing and Urban Development uses 3.36 as the break for “affordable” homes. Generally, a lower ratio implies more home affordability since the home's cost is closer to the owner's household income, whereas a higher ratio implies homeowners might be living in a home that could be stretching their current household income. The ratios shown below all show a lack of affordability that is more pronounced for Hispanic households (5.5), Black households (5.4), and Other Race households (4.8).

Exhibit 41. Ratio of median home value to median household income of homeowners, by race and ethnicity, 2022



Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS PUMS 5-year data, 2018-22. * White (4.4), Black (5.4), Asian (4.5), Hispanic (5.5), and Other (4.8).





Exhibit 42. Housing cost relative to median household income of homeowners, by race and ethnicity, 2022

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS PUMS 5-year data, 2018-22.



The project team also examined segregation among diverse Communities of Color (see Exhibit 43). The analysis shows moderate segregation between White and Black populations that has persisted over time between 2000 and 2020.

Exhibit 43. Segregation of racial groups in Kitsap County, 2000–2020

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, Racial Residential Segregation – Dissimilarity Index.

	2000	2010	2020	Table Legend
White – American Indian and Alaska Native	0.32	0.36	0.38	Low segregation (0.40 and below)
White – Asian	0.33	0.32	0.31	Moderate segregation (0.41 – 0.54)
White – Black or African American	0.46	0.42	0.42	
White – Hispanic or Latinx	0.24	0.21	0.23	High Segregation (0.55 and above)
White – People of color	0.25	0.23	0.21	

Lastly, displacement risk was measured using the Puget Sound Regional Council’s (PSRC) Opportunity Mapping and Displacement Risk data. This data helps to determine where there are areas in Kitsap County that might have higher risk of displacement in possible need of protective measures.

For the displacement risk map below, green means “low” displacement risk and yellow means “moderate” displacement risk. The geography of analysis is Census tract. According to PSRC’s data, there are 54 total Census tracts in Kitsap County. Of those 54 tracts, 14 are at “moderate” risk for displacement (28 percent of all tracts). The following bullets list the “moderate” tracts and the jurisdiction they are located within or adjacent to:


- Three tracts in Port Orchard and East Port Orchard.
- Three tracts in East Bremerton
- Eight tracts in Bremerton



According to PSRC, “displacement risk is a composite of indicators representing five elements of neighborhood displacement risks: socio-demographics, transportation qualities, neighborhood characteristics, housing, and civic engagement.”

Exhibit 44. Displacement risk in Kitsap County

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, Racial Residential Segregation – Dissimilarity Index.




Section 6. Employment Profile

Kitsap County’s largest employment sectors include the public sector, health care and social assistance, and retail trade. Exhibit 45 shows that between 2000 and 2021, public sector employment represented the largest employment sector in Kitsap County, with 18,813 and 26,544 covered employees in each respective year.

The second largest employment sector, health care and social assistance, had less than half the number of employees in the public sector, with 8,151 covered employees in 2000 and 11,474 employees in 2021. The only other sector following closely behind the health care and social assistance sector in 2021 was retail and trade, with 10,523 covered employees.

Exhibit 45. Change in Kitsap County’s Covered Employment, by Major Employment Sector, 2000–2021

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, Covered Employment Estimates, 2000–2021.




Between 2000 and 2021, employment in Kitsap County has increased most in the public sector, health care and social assistance sector, and professional, scientific, and technical services sector (see Exhibit 46 below). Public sector employment increased by four percent,



while health care and social assistance employment increased by almost half that amount. Employment decreased most in the public education sector and retail trade sector, at almost 3 percent and 2 percent respectively. Employment sectors such as private educational services and transportation and warehousing remained relatively consistent.

Exhibit 46. Change in the Distribution of Kitsap County’s Covered Employment, by Major Employment Sector, 2000–2021

Source: Puget Sound Regional Council, Covered Employment Estimates, 2000–2021.



Changes in Annual Wages for Kitsap County

Annual wage data was currently only available for Kitsap County via the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) data series. **On an inflation-adjusted basis, annual wages for covered employment jobs in Kitsap County increased by approximately \$7,820, or by about 14.5 percent (see Exhibit 47 below for more detail). The employment sectors with the largest wage growth over the 2010 to 2021 include finance and insurance (\$28,402, or 46.6 percent), information (\$23,933, or 36 percent), professional and technical services (\$16,489, or 23 percent), other services (\$14,692, or 62 percent), and real estate and rental and leasing (\$13,979, or 41 percent).**

Exhibit 47. Change in Kitsap County's Average Annual Wages, by NAICS Employment Sector, in 2021 Inflation-Adjusted Dollars 2010–2021

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW) Annual Averages, 2010 and 2021. Note: The following NAICS Employment sectors, Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and hunting and Mining, quarrying, and oil and gas extracting, were not included due to the lack of data availability. **NAICS** = The North American Industry Classification System is the federal standard for classifying business establishments related to the U.S. business economy.

NAICS Employment Sector	Kitsap County Annual Wages			Change, 2010 (Adjusted) – 2021	
	2010 (Unadjusted)	2010 (Inflation- Adjusted)	2021	Diff.	Percent Change
Utilities	\$76,728	\$95,347	\$104,572	\$9,225	9.7
Construction	\$46,728	\$58,067	\$63,398	\$5,331	9.2
Manufacturing	\$42,296	\$52,560	\$62,414	\$9,854	18.7
Wholesale Trade	\$48,983	\$60,869	\$73,556	\$12,687	20.8
Retail Trade	\$26,910	\$33,440	\$38,491	\$5,051	15.1
Transportation and Warehousing	\$31,784	\$39,497	\$50,243	\$10,746	27.2
Information	\$53,117	\$66,007	\$89,940	\$23,933	36.3
Finance and Insurance	\$49,051	\$60,954	\$89,940	\$28,402	46.6
Real estate and Rental and Leasing	\$27,296	\$33,920	\$47,899	\$13,979	41.2
Professional and Technical Services	\$57,506	\$71,461	\$87,950	\$16,489	23.1
Management of Companies and Enterprises	\$79,214	\$98,436	\$85,761	(\$12,675)	(12.9)
Administrative and Waste Management Services	\$33,205	\$41,263	\$47,274	\$6,011	14.6
Educational Services	\$29,020	\$36,062	\$36,534	\$472	1.3
Healthcare and Social Assistance	\$38,150	\$47,408	\$52,550	\$5,142	10.8
Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation	\$15,854	\$19,701	\$25,831	\$6,130	31.1
Accommodation and Food Services	\$15,069	\$18,726	\$24,463	\$5,737	30.6
Other Services (except Public Admin)	\$18,950	\$23,548	\$38,240	\$14,692	62.4
All Government	\$53,036	\$65,906	\$72,596	\$6,690	10.2
Federal Government	\$74,880	\$93,051	\$87,750	(\$5,301)	(5.7)
State Government	\$40,882	\$50,803	\$63,676	\$12,873	25.3
Local Government	\$43,346	\$49,494	\$66,362	\$12,498	23.2
Total (All Industries)	\$43,439	\$52,980	\$61,799	\$7,819	14.5


In Kitsap County, employment among the prime working-age population has remained relatively consistent throughout the last 20 years. Prime working age is defined as the



population aged between 25 and 64 years. As seen in Exhibit 48, the share of employed working-age persons out of the total working age population in Kitsap County was at 38 percent in 2021. This share has not changed much from its 2000 rate of 37 percent.

Exhibit 48. Employment-to-Population Ratio for the Prime Age Working Population (25 to 64 Years of Age) in Kitsap County, 2000–2021

Source: Washington Employment Security Department, Local Employment Dynamics (LED) data for workers by age group; Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM), April 1 population estimates by age and sex.




The maps displayed in Exhibit 49 (below) demonstrate employment density throughout the Kitsap County region between 2010 and 2019. The map shows density of employment via varying shades of purple, where the darker shades of purple represent higher density of employment.

The locations of higher employment density have remained relatively consistent throughout the past 10 years. In the north, a higher density of employment is centralized around several urban centers including Silverdale (with a concentration of retail and healthcare facilities), Bainbridge Island’s Downtown Winslow area and Day Road area, the area surrounding the Clearwater Suquamish casino, the Navy Bangor Base, and Downtown Poulsbo. In the south, employment is clustered around East Port Orchard, Downtown Bremerton, and nearby Bremerton within the Navy Yard urban area with the shipyard employment.

Exhibit 49. Change in Employment Density, Kitsap County, 2010–2019

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, OnTheMap, LEHD Data, 2010 and 2019.



Labor Force and Unemployment Trends


Kitsap County's unemployment rate has fluctuated in a similar fashion as the state and U.S. unemployment rates throughout the years between 2000 and 2021 (see Exhibit 50). The highest points of unemployment in Kitsap County occurred in 2010 at 8.6 percent (associated with the Great Recession) and in 2020 at 7.7 percent (during the early months of the COVID-19 pandemic).

As of 2021, employment has mostly bounced back with the unemployment rate back to the lower unemployment rates the County experienced in 2016-2017, at 5 percent. Washington State and the U.S had similar unemployment rates in 2021, at 5.2 and 5.3 percent respectively.



Exhibit 50. Annual Unemployment Rate, Kitsap County, Washington, the United States, 2000–2021

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics (LAUS), 2000–2021.



Industry and Sector Employment Trends

In Exhibit 51, provided below, Kitsap County is showing some large changes in the representation of establishments¹⁷ across the healthcare and social assistance employment sector and in uncategorized services outside of public administration. While establishments representing other services (except public administration) have decreased from 1,807 in 2010, to 601 establishments in 2021, the establishments in the health care and social assistance sector have increased in number, from 570 in 2010 to 1,639 in 2021.

The health care and social assistance sector now represents the largest number of establishments across all employment sectors in Kitsap County. Kitsap County is currently experiencing increased demand for healthcare services, consequently this growth trend is expected to continue in the future. Other employment sectors with many establishments include the professional and technical services sector and the construction sector.

¹⁷ An establishment is defined as a single economic unit that produces goods or services. A hospital, a restaurant, or a government office are examples of an establishment. Establishments often have a single physical location (an address) and are predominantly engaged in one type of economic activity (e.g., healthcare). Establishments differ from firms insofar that a firm can have one or more establishments and each of those various establishments could engage in different economic activities. Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages Questions and Answers. More can be read about how establishments are defined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics at the following web address: <https://www.bls.gov/cew/questions-and-answers.htm>.

Exhibit 51. Change in Establishments in Kitsap County, by Major Employment Sector, 2010–2021

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW), 2010 and 2021 data.




Exhibit 52 details the location quotient— or how specialized a sector is in a county relative to the state—for major employment sectors in Kitsap County. Located on the y-axis of the exhibit, a location quotient value of 1.0 indicates that the sector’s level of specialization in Kitsap County is on par with statewide trends (i.e., not specialized). If the location quotient exceeds 1.0, this suggests the industry is concentrated or specialized in the county. The higher the location quotient, the more concentrated the sector in the analysis areas. Employment sectors with bigger location quotients typically indicate a competitive advantage and, in turn, a higher likelihood of attracting new establishments in that sector to the region. The average annual percent change in employment over the 2010 to 2019 period is denoted on the x-axis.


Each major employment sector is denoted by a bubble. The size of the bubble indicates the number of covered jobs in each sector. Sector names are detailed for each bubble, along with its location quotient (left-side) and total covered employment in 2019 (right-side). Additionally, quadrants are labeled in clockwise order as *Star*, *Emerging*, *Transforming*, and *Mature*. *Star* employment sectors are concentrated in the region; they are strong clusters (in terms of concentration and growth) that help the county stand out from others. *Emerging* sectors are



under-represented in the county (usually little to no concentration) but are growing on an average annual basis. *Transforming* sectors are both under-represented in the county and losing jobs. *Mature* sectors are concentrated in the county, like *Star* sectors, but with declining jobs.

Exhibit 52. Location Quotient of Major Employment Sectors in Kitsap County, 2010–2021

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (QCEW), 2010 and 2021.



According to Exhibit 52, shown above, Kitsap County’s *Star* employment sectors are Government, Retail, and Leisure and Hospitality sectors. These sectors are highly concentrated in the county and are gaining jobs. Most other employment sectors in Kitsap County are *Emerging*, while the educational services and general services sectors are *Transforming*, or losing traction in Kitsap County.

The Innovation Intelligence¹⁸ tool details the innovation capacity and output of a region by aggregating over fifty different innovation measures (e.g., patent technology diffusion, job expansions-to-contractations ratio, per capita personal income growth) . There are five major index categories that roll up into a single “headline” innovation index. Three of these five major categories are innovation inputs (human capital and knowledge creation, business dynamics,

¹⁸ Innovation Intelligence (I13) is hosted on StatsAmerica (www.statsamerica.org) and managed by the [Indiana Business Research Center](#) at Indiana University's Kelley School of Business and funded partially by the U.S. Commerce Department’s Economic Development Administration (2021 data release).

and business profile), and the remaining two are innovation outputs (employment and productivity, and economic well-being).

Human Capital and Knowledge Creation: Kitsap County ranks among the top three percent (63 out of 3,110 total counties) of all counties in the United States in the human capital and knowledge creation index. This index contains statistical measurements like educational attainment, STEM education and occupations, and technology diffusion (e.g., patent technology diffusion).

Business Dynamics: The business dynamics index measures accounts for measurements like establishment formation, establishment dynamics (e.g., establishment births divided by establishment deaths), venture capital dollar measures, and venture capital count measures (e.g., initial public offerings, average annual venture capital deals). **Kitsap County fares among the top nine percent of all counties, ranking 261 out of 3,110 counties.**

Business Profile: The business profile index includes measurements such as foreign direct investment (FDI) attractiveness (e.g., foreign and national employment indices), connectivity (e.g., residential high-speed connection density, farm operators with internet access), dynamic industry profiles (e.g., high-tech, early-in-life-cycle establishment ratio), and proprietorship (e.g., availability of capital from all banks, proprietor income to total wages and salaries). **Kitsap County ranked among the top 14 percent (414 of 3,110 total counties) of all counties nationwide.**

Employment and Productivity: Of the five major index categories, Kitsap County's weakest ranking is in employment and productivity, placing among the top 32 percent of all counties nationwide (ranked 978 of 3,110 counties). This index accounts for direct outcomes of innovative activity (patent diversity), economic growth (Gross Domestic Product per worker), and regional desirability (industry cluster diversity, strength, and growth).

Economic Well-being: Economic well-being assesses a county's standard of living and related economic outcomes. These include, but are not limited to, the average poverty rate, unemployment rate, net migration, and income inequality. **Kitsap County ranks among the top 11 percent of all counties (336 of 3,110 total counties) in economic well-being.**

Headline Innovation Index Summary: Index values were computed for 3,110 counties in the United States and then subsequently ranked for ease of nationwide comparison. Aggregating all the indices detailed above, **Kitsap County's "headline" innovation index placed it among the top five percent of all counties nationwide (ranked 129 of 3,110 counties).** See Exhibit 53 for



Kitsap County’s innovation index values and how the County ranks relative to all counties across the nation.¹⁹

Exhibit 53. Innovation Index Measurements, Kitsap County, 2021

Source: Indiana Business Research Center, “Driving Regional Innovation: The Innovation Index 2.0.” 2021.

Innovation Indices	Kitsap County Index Value, 2021	Kitsap County’s Index Rank (out of 3,110 Counties)	Median Index Value (of all U.S. Counties)
Headline Innovation Index	136.8	129	113.0
Human Capital and Knowledge Creation	156.9	63	118.3
Business Dynamics	147.0	261	119.7
Business Profile	98.2	414	73.0
Employment and Productivity	129.5	978	124.4
Economic Well-Being	152.4	336	131.4

¹⁹ Additionally, ECONorthwest provided the median index value of all United States counties (3,110 total). This is not a national median, as the Indiana Business Research Center designed the values to be compared by geographic level (i.e., one should not compare county index values to statewide index values or MSA index values).

Appendix

Construction Cost Influences

The Puget Sound regional economy has grown at an astounding rate in the past decade, influenced by strong population growth as new residents move to the area seeking economic and educational opportunities, and the area's natural beauty. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, total employment in the four-county region (King, Kitsap, Snohomish, and Pierce Counties) grew 23 percent from 2010 to 2018, while total population in these four counties grew approximately 12 percent.²⁰

Hampered by the housing market crash and economic recession, however, the regional housing market did not produce enough new housing in response to this growing demand, particularly at prices affordable to the majority of incomes. The Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) estimates that housing units in the four-county region only grew by 6.7 percent over the same period of strong economic growth.²¹

Housing markets operate regionally: housing prices and availability in one location may influence housing demand in another area, as households seek affordable options. Seattle's strong economic growth and own housing underproduction has led to rising prices there, forcing many households to decide whether to stay put and face increasing cost burdens, or try to find lower cost housing in other parts of the region and beyond. These regional trends have strong implications for cities in Kitsap County, which sits close to the economic engine of Seattle.

Construction and Labor Costs

Another key driver of the housing supply and production of housing is the cost of construction. The costs of construction materials can limit supply and affordability. In the two years since the onset of the pandemic, construction costs have grown faster than at any point since 2009, according to the Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index (CCI).²² Construction costs in Seattle have drastically outpaced the national average post-pandemic. In 2020 Q1 (around the time the pandemic began), Seattle's CCI sat at 138, about four percent higher than the national average CCI of 133. As of 2022 Q2, Seattle's CPI is about 10 percent higher than the national average. Exhibit 54 shows the change in CCI for both the nation and Seattle since 2009 Q1.

²⁰ Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2018 Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages for the four-county region (King, Kitsap, Snohomish and Pierce Counties). Available from: <https://www.bls.gov/cew/downloadable-data-files>


²¹ Current Population: Region. Estimates from U.S. Census Bureau and the Washington State Office of Financial Management. Available from: <https://www.psrc.org/rdp-population>

²² Engineering News-Record, Construction Cost Index data, national and City of Seattle estimates, January 2009 – June 2022.



Exhibit 54. Seattle and National Construction Cost Index, 2009Q1 – 2022Q2

Source: Engineering News-Record Construction Cost Index, 2009-2022 (January 2009 is indexed to 100).



In the aftermath of the housing market crash of 2008, many firms in the development and construction sector faced layoffs. As a result, architects, contractors, and laborers retired or found new professions. The construction sector was hit particularly hard and saw nationwide employment declines of 19 percent from a peak in 2007 to 2015.²³ Despite some recovery post-recession, a lack of available trained construction and trade workers and subcontractors continues to be a drag on the housing market. Limited labor availability increases competition, bids up prices, increases time to completion, and consequently limits overall housing production. Each of these factors hurts housing affordability.

²³ Alana Semuels. 2015. "Where have all the Construction Workers Gone?" The Atlantic Magazine. www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/02/where-have-all-the-construction-workers-gone/385417/ Data reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Primary Drivers of Housing Supply, Puget Sound Region, 2020

Jan 2020

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY IN THE CENTRAL PUGET SOUND REGION

What Factors Impact Affordability?

A number of factors affect the cost of renting or purchasing a home. In the central Puget Sound region, economic, demographic, and land use factors have led to an increasingly competitive housing market.

Land Availability

Just over **3** new homes were added to the housing supply every hour in 2019.

Source: OFM, 2019

Market Availability

Nearly **2/3** of housing units are zoned detached single-family, often the most expensive home ownership option.

Source: PSRC

Time and Cost to Build

Nearly **2/3** of housing units are zoned detached single-family, often the most expensive home ownership option.

Source: PSRC

Capacity of Construction Sector

The region added more than **6** jobs every hour in 2018.

Source: PSRC

Zoning

1 in 5 of the region's residents live in walking distance to current or future high-capacity transit.

Source: Center for Neighborhood Technology, 2017

Demographics

Household size is expected to decrease from **2.50** to **2.36** people by 2050.

Source: PSRC

Access to Credit

Transportation Access

Real Estate Investment

Job and Wage Growth

Real Estate Investment

Metro Area Home Prices and Rents

Year	Rents (\$)	Home Prices (\$)
2011	1,000	250,000
2012	1,000	250,000
2013	1,000	250,000
2014	1,000	250,000
2015	1,000	250,000
2016	1,000	250,000
2017	1,000	250,000
2018	1,000	250,000
2019	1,500	400,000

1 in 5 renters pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

3 in 5 low-income renters pay more than 50% of their income on housing.

Source: CHRS, 2014

White households are four times more likely to own a home than a household of color.

A household needs to earn \$150,000 to afford a median-priced home. That is equivalent to six full time jobs at minimum wage.

Want to learn more about PSRC's housing work?
Please visit www.psrc.org/housing or scan the QR code to learn more about regional housing efforts.

Puget Sound Regional Council



Appendix C. Racially Disparate Impacts Analysis



Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan's Racially Disparate Impact Parts

Selected Definitions

HB 1220 added new terms in the housing element statute. Commerce developed the following definitions with a statewide stakeholder group of planners to create a common understanding of the undefined terms.

- **Discriminatory effect:** The effect, regardless of intent, of differentiated outcomes for a group based on a protected classification. May be an action or failure to act. Protected classifications include race/color, national origin, religion/creed, sex/gender/domestic violence status, familial status, disability, marital status, sexual orientation and military/veteran status.
- **Disinvestment:** A process by which a community is not prioritized for investment, or by which a system, policy or action disincentivizes investment in a specific area. Disinvestment processes occur over time, often in the long term.
- **Displacement:** The process by which a household is forced to move from its community because of conditions beyond their control.
 - *Physical displacement:* Households are directly forced to move for reasons such as eviction, foreclosure, natural disaster or deterioration in housing quality.
 - *Economic displacement:* Households are compelled to move by rising rents or costs of home ownership like property taxes.
 - *Cultural displacement:* Residents are compelled to move because the people and the institutions that make up their cultural community have left the area.
- **Displacement risk:** The likelihood that a household, business or organization will be displaced from its community.
- **Exclusion in housing:** The act or effect of shutting or keeping certain populations out of housing within a specified area, in a manner that may be intentional or unintentional, but which leads to non-inclusive impacts.
- **Gentrification:** The process of neighborhood change resulting in households being unable to remain in their neighborhood or move into a neighborhood that would have been previously accessible to them. The neighborhood change includes economic change in a historically disinvested neighborhood, such as rising land values and rising housing costs, as well as demographic change representing a shift in the income, racial composition, or educational level of residents. This is also referred to as “neighborhood exclusionary change” or “exclusionary displacement.” Gentrification creates discriminatory effects when it forces the displacement of long-time residents and businesses.
- **Inclusionary zoning:** A regulatory tool that requires permanent affordable units to be included within new residential development projects, or requires payment for



construction of such units elsewhere (fee-in-lieu). “Permanent” refers to affordable unit availability in the long term, specifically, for 50 years as defined by Washington code.

- **Infrastructure:** The facilities and systems that serve a country, city, or area, such as transportation, parks, communication systems, energy and utility systems, and schools.
- **Market forces:** Economic factors that impact the provision, price and/or demand for housing.
- **Racially disparate impacts:** When policies, rules or other systems result in a disproportionate impact on one or more racial groups.

DRAFT

Community History and Population Characteristics

Community History

Before the White settlement of what is now known as Kitsap County, the land and islands between Puget Sound and Hood Canal were home to the Suquamish Tribe, the S'Klallam Tribe, and the Skokomish Tribe.¹ In Kitsap County, the Suquamish and the Port Gamble S'Klallam people live on and protect the land and waters of their ancestors for future generations as guaranteed by the Point Elliot Treaty of 1855. In addition, the Treaty of Point No Point of 1855 ensures that the Jamestown S'Klallam, Skokomish, and Chimakum People maintain their hunting, fishing, and gathering rights on "usual and accustomed" grounds which include land and waterways within Kitsap County.

The Suquamish Tribe had permanent villages throughout what is now Kitsap County, in locations like Poulsbo, Silverdale, Hansville, and Bremerton.² However, Suqua, the principal village of the Suquamish Tribe, was located in present day Suquamish on the Agate Passage.

The S'Klallam Tribe were deeply rooted throughout the Hood Canal area, living in seasonal and permanent villages and sharing sites in Port Gamble and Port Townsend with the Chemakum people.³ The S'Klallam hunted, fished, and gathered in locations in the San Juan Islands, in the Olympics, along the Straits of Juan De Fuca, and along Hood Canal.

The Skokomish Tribe was the largest community part of the nine Twana Indians people, whose aboriginal territory encompassed the Hood Canal drainage basin, or much of what is now known as central Kitsap County.⁴

In 1855, the Point No Point and Point Elliot treaties relegated the Suquamish to the Port Madison Reservation. The S'Klallam and the Skokomish were assigned to the Skokomish Reservation at the south end of Hood Canal in present day Mason County. Although the S'Klallam were assigned to the Skokomish Reservation, many members of the S'Klallam Tribe stayed near Port Gamble across the bay in Little Boston. In 1938, the S'Klallam received their own reserve called the Port Gamble Reservation.

The California Gold Rush in 1850 was the driving force behind the White settlement on the Kitsap Peninsula. San Francisco, the largest city on the West Coast of North America, burned down several times, and the resulting great demand for lumber sent sea captains and entrepreneurs to the Puget Sound. In 1853, Maine native W.C. Talbot incentivized the forced relocation of S'Klallam people to construct a lumber mill in Port Gamble. Philadelphia native William Renton opened a mill in Port Orchard in 1854 and another in Blakely Harbor on Bainbridge Island.

The Kitsap Peninsula was originally part of King County and Jefferson County. Peninsula mill owners applied to the Territorial Legislature for their own county. In 1857, what is now known as

¹ David Wilma – Kitsap County: Thumbnail History, 2006; Historylink.org

² Suquamish Tribe - [Suquamish History and Culture](#)

³ Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe – [History and Culture](#)

⁴ Skokomish Indian Tribe – [Culture and History](#)



Kitsap County was formally created. The original county seat was in Port Madison, but County commissioners moved it to Port Orchard in 1893, where the county seat currently resides.

The large old-growth trees, lumber mills, shipyards, and waterways were incredibly influential in the early development of the Kitsap Peninsula. In the 1850s, the Kitsap Peninsula was the wealthiest community, per capita, in the Puget Sound, and the Washington mills produced twice as much lumber as four times as many mills in Oregon. In the 1870s, Port Madison alone produced more sailing ships than the entire San Francisco Bay area. Many of the mills in the region closed by the early 1920s, but the mill and company town at Port Gamble continued cutting lumber until 1994, 142 years after first opening.

More recent development of Kitsap County was influenced by the expansion of military facilities, highways, and ferry service. In the 1880s, Port Orchard had a repair facility for naval operations in the Pacific Ocean. This eventually led to the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard at Bremerton being built in 1891 and cementing military activity as a major component of the County's permanent economy. A torpedo testing station in Keyport (1914), the refueling station at Manchester (1938), and the nuclear submarine base at Bangor (1977) were military facility expansions in the 20th century that heavily influenced growth in Kitsap County.

Until World War II, Kitsap County was mostly agricultural except for military activities. Highways like Highway 16, which connects Tacoma and Bremerton, or Highway 3, which connects Bremerton and Silverdale, made possible the development of Kitsap County as a suburban and vacation home area. Reliable and convenient ferry service also aided in parts of the County becoming a bedroom community for people working in greater Seattle. Between 1940 and 2005, Kitsap County's population multiplied by more than five times. In 2022, the County's population was approximately 281,000 people.⁵

⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM), 2022 postcensal estimate.

Displacement Risk

Regional Anti-displacement Planning Policies

Both Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) Multicounty Planning Policies (MPP) and Kitsap County's Countywide Planning Policies (CPP) have policies for cities to identify displacement risk and use strategies to mitigate displacement impacts.

MPP-H-12 says:

"Identify potential physical, economic, and cultural displacement of low-income households and marginalized populations that may result from planning, public investments, private redevelopment, and market pressure. Use a range of strategies to mitigate displacement impacts to the extent feasible."

CPP-D-6 says:

"As the region continues to grow, population and employment growth is focused within our urban areas. As redevelopment takes place, however, there is a potential for physical, economic, and cultural displacement of low-income households that may result from planning, public investments, private development, and market pressures. As important planning, transportation, and redevelopment takes place:

- a. The Counties and Cities should develop coordinated strategies and interjurisdictional processes between the County and cities to mitigate the impacts of displacement.*
- b. Counties and Cities should also implement flexible strategies that will encourage the development of a range of affordable housing, both public and private."*

CPP-AH-6 says:


"Physical, economic, and cultural displacement of low-income households may result from planning, public investments, private redevelopment and market pressure. Should develop a range of strategies to mitigate displacement impacts as planning for future growth occurs."



Kitsap County Displacement Risk

According to PSRC's [Displacement Risk Map](#), most of Kitsap County scores low for displacement risk (see **Exhibit 1** below).

Exhibit 1 – Kitsap County's displacement risk



Source: PSRC Displacement Risk Interactive Map, 2023

Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Housing Elements Policy Review

As part of this Racially Disparate Impact analysis, MAKERS' evaluated the Land Use and Housing elements of the Comprehensive Plan in relation to the following questions:

- Does this policy contribute to racially disparate impacts or exclusion in housing?
- Is the policy effective in accommodating more housing?
- Does the policy increase displacement risk?
- Does the policy language include vague terms that could be used to marginalize communities of color?

The analysis compared goal, policy, and strategy language between the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and the draft 2024 updated Comprehensive Plan. Findings for the Land Use and Housing elements can be found below in Table 1 (LU = Land Use; HHS = Housing and Human Services).

Table 1 – Land Use and Housing RDI Policy Review

Original Policy	Proposed Policy or Development Regulation Changes in Draft Comp Plan	Racially Disparate Impact Connection
<p>No Strategy</p>	<p>New Land Use Strategy 3.a. Explore racial equity assessment tools (e.g., Racial Equity Impact Assessment Toolkit from Race Forward) to evaluate development regulation update proposals.</p>	<p>Commits to exploring whether a formal process that considers racial equity during evaluation or development of new development regulation changes.</p>
<p>LU Policy 6. Where appropriate, encourage mixed use, high density uses, and Transit Oriented Development (TOD) to reduce reliance on the Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV). Also see LU Policy 15.</p>	<p>New Land Use Goal 12. Facilitate a coordinated land use and transportation pattern that reduces the reliance on the Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV). Also see New Land Use Policy 6.4.</p>	<p>The average annual cost of owning a car continues to rise, reaching around \$10,000 a year in 2023 (AAA, 2023; New York Times, 2023). Reliance on owning a SOV can place a financial burden on people with lower incomes, which is disproportionately connected to people of color. Additionally, BIPOC communities are disproportionately</p>



		represented in fatal traffic crashes, pedestrian traffic deaths, and bicyclist traffic deaths (Governors Highway Safety Association, 2021).
HHS Policy 12. Identify and remove regulatory barriers that limits access to or the provision of a diverse affordable housing supply.	Kitsap County has proposed to remove minimum lot sizes and dimensions, increased densities, increased heights, and reduced setbacks in many urban residential zones. All proposed changes are meant to remove regulatory barriers and make it easier to build more housing. Also see Housing Policy 2.1.	A lack of affordable housing impacts all low-income households and raises the risk of people becoming homeless. Regionally, homelessness disproportionately effects people of color. Regulatory barriers also negatively impact affordable housing development. Therefore, removing barriers makes it easier to build affordable housing, which has positive impacts for people of color.
HHS Policy 14. Disperse affordable housing opportunities throughout the County.	An important policy to keep in the Comprehensive Plan. The draft update document updates this policy in " Housing Policy 6.3. " Consider further updates to language that include priority near higher opportunity areas.	Concentrating affordable housing in limited parts of a jurisdiction has negative impacts on the residents, who are more likely to be people of color. Concentration of affordable housing not only are correlated with areas of less investment, but it also limits people's ability to have choices on the areas they can live.
No Policy	New Housing Policy 1.4. Coordinate with Tribes, cities, agencies, and community organizations,	A policy added in the draft Comprehensive Plan Update to support decreasing displacement

	especially cultural groups, on strategies to mitigate the impacts of displacement in the preservation, rehabilitation, and development process.	risk. Also, see housing strategies 1.f and 1.g
No Policy	New Housing Policy 1.6. Support programs and resources that reduce energy use and increase climate resiliency in housing preservation, rehabilitation, and development, especially for communities historically marginalized and underserved.	A policy added in the draft Comprehensive Plan Update that gets closer to specifically calling out supporting climate resiliency and improving sustainability for racial groups that have historically been disparately impacted.
No Strategy	New Housing Strategy 2.d. Evaluate existing development regulations and consider modifications to allow for boarding houses, Single Room Occupancy buildings, and micro-units. This would include definitions, modifications to use tables, and dimensional regulations. Additionally, examine how applications of the relevant building codes may affect the viability of these housing types.	Single Room Occupancy (SROs), micro-units, and other co-living housing can provide market-rate housing as low as 50% AMI. Updating development standards to allow these will positively impact more affordable housing.
No Policy	New Housing Policy 3.3. Mitigate documented displacement impacts occurring as part of the affordable housing development process.	A policy added in the draft Comprehensive Plan Update to support decreasing displacement risk.
No Policy	New Housing Policy 6.2. Coordinate with Tribes, jurisdictions, agencies, and community partners to identify and remove local	A policy added in the draft Comprehensive Plan Update that specifically calls out support “for populations historically



	regulatory barriers that limit the provision of a diverse supply of housing units affordable to low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households, especially for populations historically affected by systematic inequities.	affected by systemic inequities.” Also, see housing strategies 6.c., 6.d., and 6.e.
No Goal	New Housing Goal 8. Mitigate risk of displacement	A Goal added in the draft Comprehensive Plan Update to support decreasing displacement risk.

Recommendations

MAKERS has completed reviews of Washington state new housing legislation and completed a RDI analysis on Kitsap County’s current Comprehensive Plan Land Use and Housing elements. Below are highlighted adjustments that Kitsap County’s draft updated Comprehensive Plan has included that could increase inclusion and reduce disparate impacts.

- Increasing densities in current single-family UGA areas as locations for more affordable and varied housing choices. This includes allowing and reducing barriers to townhomes, ADUs, and duplexes.
- The updated Draft Comprehensive Plan has recommended reducing or removing minimum lot sizes, minimum lot dimensions, setbacks, and parking mandates.
- The updated Draft Comprehensive Plan has recommended allowing specific LAMIRDs to develop ADUs by right.
- The updated Draft Comprehensive Plan has recommended a policy to pursue tools to improve and streamline permit review processes, including efforts to reduce permitting timelines, bolster staff capacity for permit and application review, and other improvements to processes related to regulatory predictability.
- The updated Draft Comprehensive Plan has recommended a policy to evaluate existing development regulations and consider modifications to allow for boarding houses, Single Room Occupancy buildings, and micro-units. As SROs, micro-units, and other co-living housing can provide market-rate housing as low as 50% AMI.

Appendix D. Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy



Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy

Prepared for

Kitsap County
614 Division Street
Port Orchard, WA 98366

Prepared by

Parametrix
60 Washington Avenue, Suite 390
Bremerton, WA 98337
T. 360.377.0014 F. 1.855.542.6353
www.parametrix.com

Google earth

Image Landsat

CITATION

Parametrix. 2018. Silverdale
Transportation Implementation Strategy.
Prepared by Parametrix, Bremerton, WA.
June 2018.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
SILVERDALE TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY	1
IMPLEMENTATION GOALS	2
PRIORITIZED LIST OF PROJECTS	4
PROJECT DETAILS AND DELIVERY OPTIONS	12
Ridgetop Corridor Improvements	12
Phased Implementation	13
Silverdale Way Corridor Improvements	18
Spot Improvements	29
Opportunity Improvements	31
IMPROVEMENTS CONSIDERED BUT NOT RECOMMENDED	33
Myhre Road Extension to Randall Way	33
Four-Lane Silverdale Way South of Byron Street	35
LIST OF FIGURES	
1 Current and Planned Projects in Silverdale	2
2 Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy Project Outcomes	4
3 Silverdale TIS Projects and Implementation Timeline	9
4 Traffic Volumes throughout the Day at Ridgetop Blvd west of SR 303	12
5 Ridgetop Corridor Phased Implementation Strategies	14
6 Protected Intersection Example	15
7 SR 303 Interchange Improvements, Option 1	16
8 SR 303 Interchange Improvements, Option 2	17
9 Silverdale Way Implementation Phasing Strategies	19
10 South Hub Intersection Improvements	20
11 South Hub Option – Phase 1	21
12 South Hub Option – Phase 2	22
13 South Hub Option – Phase 3	23
14 South Hub Option – Phase 4	24
15 Randall Way Extension Options	25
16 Hub Intersection Traffic Control Options	26
17 Central Hub Phase 1: NB Right Turn Lane at Silverdale Way/Ridgetop	27
18 Central Hub Phase 2: Poplars Ave Extension	28
19 Bucklin Hill Gap Project	30
20 Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Way Intersection Improvements	30
21 Anderson Hill Road Improvements	31
22 Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway Concept	32
23 Randall Way Bike Lanes and Multi-Use Pathway	33

TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

24	Myhre Road Extension to Randall Way	34
25	Lane Silverdale Way South of Byron Street	35

LIST OF TABLES

1	Key Silverdale TIS Findings	2
2	Implementation Priorities within Silverdale	5
3	Prioritized List of Projects	7
4	Prioritized List of Improvements Project Costs.....	9
5	Ridgetop Corridor Implementation Strategies	12
6	Myhre Road Extension to Randal Way Findings	34

INTRODUCTION

The Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy (TIS) is a technical analysis project to identify a prioritized project delivery strategy for Silverdale to be implemented via the County’s Transportation Improvement Process. The technical analysis is based on the growth assumptions identified in the 2016 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update and does not include alternatives to the Comprehensive Plan land use assumptions.

The intent of the Silverdale TIS is to:

- Validate and/or refine prior “existing and future” transportation circulation and performance analysis and refine or rework analysis, as needed, to support multimodal strategies and project development.
 - Validate prior design/engineering concepts and identify/analyze alternative strategies and projects.
 - Identify strategies and projects for detailed operational and circulation analysis, engineering/design, and cost estimating.
 - Explore financial strategies to support implementation.
 - Select a prioritized Transportation Implementation Strategy for Silverdale that will:
 - Support multimodal connectivity and the Regional Center;
 - Provide specific scope, design, phasing, and estimates to support program management, systems management, and project delivery;
 - Be financially implementable and directly applied to the County’s short-term (1-6 years), mid-term (7-12 years), and long-term transportation implementation plans;
 - Identify requirements to support amendments to Silverdale’s development regulations and roadway design standards; and
 - Support development and potential implementation of identified funding strategies.
-
- | | |
|--|--|
| | Expected Project Outcomes |
| | ✓ Validate and/or refine existing multimodal strategies and projects |
| | ✓ Identify/analyze alternate strategies and projects |
| | ✓ Identify priorities |
| | ✓ Develop implementation and financial strategies |
-

SILVERDALE TRANSPORTATION IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

The Silverdale TIS laid out a set of potential transportation improvements for the Silverdale Regional Center. Potential improvement ideas were developed from multiple sources including public comments at three open houses, ideas from prior studies and a project working group composed of local Silverdale residents, Kitsap Transit and Kitsap County staff. A technical analysis was performed to evaluate the benefits, potential impacts and costs of proposed improvements, including safety benefits, roadway circulation benefits, non-motorized benefits and project implementation costs. The outcome of this analysis was the development of a prioritized list of improvements with a phased implementation strategy that allows for funding discrete stand-alone projects as funding becomes available. Some key needs from the study process that informed the implementation strategies identified in this document are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Key Silverdale TIS Needs

Key Needs		
Non-Motorized Improvements	Roadway Improvements	Transit
Protected Intersections: Provide protected intersections that improve visibility and shield cyclists and pedestrians from conflicting traffic movements.	Roadway Capacity: Improve high growth corridors that provide circulation within Silverdale.	Transit Center: Provide improved connectivity to Kitsap Transit’s new transit center for all modes.
Low Stress Bike Lanes: Provide low stress bike lanes that allow less experienced cyclists to ride and enjoy Silverdale streets.	Safety: Improve safety by reducing conflicts and easing congestion.	Transit Corridors: Give priority to improvements in the key transit corridors (Ridgetop Boulevard and Silverdale Way)
Internal Connections: Provide better connectivity and continuity east-west and north-south through Silverdale.	Access: Manage access to adjacent properties and businesses to improve throughput and reduce conflicts.	Non-Motorized Access: Improve non-motorized access to transit at bus stops and transit facilities.
Connections to Existing: Connect to existing trails, pathways and non-motorized facilities.	Prior Investments: Implement improvements that build on or connect to prior investments.	
Complete Gaps: Complete gaps in the existing pedestrian and bike network.	Complete Streets: Implement improvements that deliver the vision of complete streets.	

IMPLEMENTATION GOALS

Past transportation investments in Silverdale have included an array of multi-modal projects that address the diverse transportation needs within Silverdale. Currently planned investments, including those under construction, are depicted in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Currently Planned Projects in Silverdale

Silverdale’s currently funded and planned transportation system improvements illustrated in Figure 1 include the following improvements:

Silverdale Way Preservation Project - This project provides ADA remediation and pavement overlay on Silverdale Way from SR 303 to Bucklin Hill Road. It also includes a portion of Bucklin Hill Road from Silverdale Way to Blaine Avenue.

Markwick Trail – This project provides a new non-motorized multi-use trail connection from Ridgetop Boulevard to Silverdale Way.

Ridgetop Improvements – As part of planned development, Ridgetop Boulevard will be widened to 5 lanes from the entrance to Harrison Hospital to SR 303. The improvements will include a new eastbound general purpose lane, sidewalk and a new signal at the realigned Sid Uhnick Drive intersection with the Harrison Hospital entrance.

Silverdale Way Complete Street Improvements – Silverdale Way from 300 feet south of Byron Street to Anderson Hill Road will be widened to 5 lanes with bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, and ADA-compliant curb ramps.

Bay Shore Drive Non-Motorized Improvements – Bay Shore Drive from Bucklin Hill Road to Washington Avenue will receive new sidewalk and ADA compliant curb ramps. The project also includes new sidewalk and ADA curb ramps on Washington Avenue from Bay Shore Drive to Silverdale Waterfront Park.

Implementation and project delivery strategies were developed for new projects to guide investment beyond the projects currently planned and funded. The investment goals and guidelines developed from public input and the project working group include:

- Invest in the transportation corridors with the highest needs for additional multi-modal capacity, circulation, mobility and safety improvements
- Provide multi-modal capacity for the expected growth
- Prioritize improvements that address immediate short term needs and provide the foundation for longer term improvements that address expected growth
- Provide strategies that move projects forward and allow flexibility to deliver different sized projects that provide incremental benefits
- Provide a list of projects and priorities that can be carried forward into the County’s Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)
- Provide strategies that implement the vision of complete streets within Silverdale

The implementation strategies presented are guided by these goals and identify discrete projects that could be funded by Kitsap County in varying sizes (small and large projects). The implementation strategies direct investment into key transportation corridors and address the highest priorities for connectivity, safety, and circulation for all modes.



Figure 2. Silverdale Transportation Implementation Strategy Project Outcomes

PRIORITIZED LIST OF PROJECTS

The prioritized list of projects for Silverdale fall into four broad categories:

Ridgetop Boulevard Corridor Improvements: This category provides improvements in the Ridgetop Boulevard corridor from SR 303 to Silverdale Way.

Silverdale Way Corridor Improvements: This category provides improvements in the Silverdale Way corridor from SR 303 to Anderson Hill Road.

Spot Improvements: This category provides spot improvements at locations throughout Silverdale but are not necessarily focused on corridor-wide needs.

Opportunity Improvements: This category identifies projects that could be funded as redevelopment occurs and/or through funding partnerships with Silverdale stakeholders and private interest groups.

Each category of improvements is divided into discrete projects that align with the priorities within that category. For each project, there may be multiple delivery options that provide flexibility to right-size the scope of the project to match the available funding.

In addition to these broad categories, specific improvements and delivery strategies were developed for the two hub intersections within Silverdale: Silverdale Way at Ridgetop Boulevard and Silverdale Way at Bucklin Hill Road. The hub intersections were identified as the two critical nodes within Silverdale’s transportation network that are critical for circulation, access, and mobility within Silverdale. The hub intersections experience the highest levels of congestion (LOS E or F) within Silverdale. These intersections provide connectivity for autos, cyclists, freight, and pedestrians, and connect to key destinations within Silverdale including Kitsap Mall, East Silverdale, Old Town, and Central Kitsap Schools.

The Implementation Strategies identify the priority projects from the array of recommended improvements within Silverdale that will be targeted for funding by Kitsap County. The priorities developed for the Silverdale Regional Center are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Implementation Priorities within Silverdale

Priority	Rationale for Priority
Ridgetop Boulevard Corridor	The Ridgetop Boulevard corridor is experiencing rapid growth in traffic from continued development and increases in retail traffic. The corridor has three of the highest accident intersections in Kitsap County. Currently the corridor does not include bike lanes and has a less than desirable non-motorized environment. Improvements in the corridor are needed to improve mobility and safety, provide non-motorized connections to the future Silverdale Transit center, and ease congestion.
Silverdale Way Corridor	The Silverdale Way corridor is the primary north-south route through Silverdale for all modes of transportation. This corridor also experiences significant congestion from traffic entering and exiting the many commercial driveways along the corridor. Maintaining mobility and access to businesses and destinations along the corridor is essential for economic vitality, connectivity and circulation. Improvements are needed to improve the non-motorized environment (particularly for pedestrians crossing Silverdale Way) and better manage access along the corridor.
Spot Improvements	Spot improvements address specific non-corridor needs and gaps in the transportation network. They may include improvements to intersections or segments of the transportation network. The highest priority spot improvements identified in the Silverdale TIS were: Bucklin Hill Road Gap, Kitsap Mall/Randall Way intersection, Anderson Hill Road (Bucklin Hill Road to Provost Road) and the Newberry Hill Road/Silverdale Way intersection.
Opportunity Projects	These projects could be implemented as stand-alone projects or in conjunction with other improvements. They identify non-motorized project opportunities that enhance and complete the non-motorized network. These projects are envisioned as projects that would be funded in whole or in part through partnerships with property owners, stakeholders and private interest groups. As opportunity projects, priorities are flexible and are subject to change as opportunities for funding and implementation develop over time.

Within these priorities, there are a mix of roadway, access management, and non-motorized improvements. Not all improvements within a corridor or category received the highest priority, nor will they be constructed at the same time or funded as a single package. Improvements within Silverdale will be constructed in logical packages that allow for the completion of discrete elements that advance the highest priorities over time. Phased implementation is the process of implementing the recommended improvement priorities in stages as funding becomes available. The phasing process provides for the implementation of buildable segments that balance needs, costs, and benefits. Table 3 summarizes a prioritized list of projects in Silverdale.

Table 3. Prioritized List of Projects

Priority Rank	Location	Project Name	Project Improvements	Total Cost (M)
1	Ridgetop Corridor	Ridgetop Phase 1 (Mickelberry to Myhre)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-lane Ridgetop with center median access control • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane • Protected intersections with U-Turn capability • Add 2nd EB GP lane and bike lane from Myhre to realigned Sid Uhnick Dr • Storm water, sanitary sewer and utilities 	\$13.7
2	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 1 (Silverdale Way @ Bucklin Hill)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add 2nd WB left-turn lane • Protected intersection improvements • Access control on WB and EB approaches 	\$2.8
	Spot Improvement	Bucklin Hill Gap (Mickelberry to Myhre)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complete 5-lane Bucklin Hill • Complete bike lane gap • Sidewalk, landscaping, storm water, utilities • Protected intersection improvements 	\$2.6
3	Ridgetop Corridor	Ridgetop Phase 2 (SR 303 Interchange)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-lane Ridgetop with bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Add dual EB left turn to NB SR 303 on-ramp • Provide a 5-lane Ridgetop beneath the SR 303 overpass <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Add dual NB left turn from NB SR 303 on-ramp to WB Ridgetop 	\$1.1 \$5.8
	Spot Improvement	Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Turn Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide dual EB to NB left turn lanes 	\$1.9
4	Ridgetop Corridor	Ridgetop Phase 3 (Silverdale Way to Blaine)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-lane Ridgetop with center median access control • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane • Protected intersections 	\$7.1
	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 2 (Silverdale Way @ Ridgetop)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add NB right turn lane • Protected intersection improvements 	\$1.5
	Opportunity Project	Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway Phase 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide multi-use pedestrian/bike pathway from Central Kitsap Schools to YMCA 	Unknown
5	Ridgetop Corridor	Ridgetop Phase 4 (Blaine to Mickelberry)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-lane Ridgetop with center median access control • New bridge over Clear Creek • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lanes • Protected intersections • Clear Creek trail connections 	\$17.2
	Opportunity Project	North Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide multi-use pedestrian/bike pathway from Randall, across Kitsap Mall to Harrison Hospital 	Unknown
6	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 3 (Randall Way Extension)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Randall extension from Bucklin Hill to Silverdale Way • New sidewalks, landscaping, low stress bike lanes on Randall extension • New protected intersections at Randall/Bucklin and Randall/Silverdale Way 	\$6.0

Priority Rank	Location	Project Name	Project Improvements	Total Cost (M)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access management on Bucklin Hill between Silverdale Way and Randall Way • Restrict WB left turn from Bucklin Hill to Randall Extension and EB left turn from Bucklin Hill to Silverdale Way 	
	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 3 (Complete Street Strawberry Creek to Bucklin)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane on Silverdale Way from Strawberry creek to Bucklin • Center median with access control on Silverdale Way • Restrict NB LT from Silverdale Way to Bucklin • No fish passage 	\$2.0
7	Spot Improvement	Anderson Hill Road (Bucklin to Provost)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Center turn lane, median and access control • New SB left turn lane • Protected intersection improvements at Anderson Hill/Bucklin Hill 	\$3.0
8	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 4 (Poplars Extension)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poplars Ave extension to Silverdale Way • New protected intersections and pedestrian crossings at Silverdale Way/Poplars Ave and Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Poplars Ave 	\$7.7
	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 4 (Complete Street Bucklin to Ridgetop)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane on Silverdale Way from Bucklin to Ridgetop • Center median with access control on Silverdale Way • Restrict NB left turn from Silverdale Way to Ridgetop Boulevard 	\$2.9
	Opportunity Project	Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway Phase 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide multi-use pedestrian/bike pathway from YMCA to Silverdale Plaza, connecting to clear creek trails and the Bucklin Hill bridge 	Unknown
9	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 5 (Complete Street Anderson Hill to Strawberry Creek)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane on Silverdale Way from Anderson Hill to Strawberry Creek • Center median with access control on Silverdale Way • Strawberry Creek fish passage 	\$5.9
10	Silverdale Way Corridor	Silverdale Way Phase 6 (Complete Street Ridgetop to SR 303)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane on Silverdale Way from Ridgetop to SR 303 • Center median with access control on Silverdale Way • Protected intersections at Kitsap Mall entrance, Myhre and Randall 	\$6.8
	Spot Improvement	Silverdale Way/Newberry Hill Roundabout	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add SB to WB slip lane from Silverdale Way to Newberry Hill • Protected intersection improvements 	\$2.1
	Opportunity Project	Randall Way Bike Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide bike lanes on Randall Way from Bucklin Hill to Silverdale Way 	Unknown

The timeline for the implementation of the prioritized list of improvements is shown below (Figure 3).

SILVERDALE TIS PROJECTS

		RIDGETOP BLVD	SILVERDALE WAY	SPOT IMPROVEMENTS	OPPORTUNITY PROJECTS
IMPLEMENTATION TIMELINE	EARLY IMPLEMENTATION	1	Ridgetop Phase 1		
		2		Bucklin Hill Gap	
		3	Ridgetop Phase 2	Kitsap Mall / Randall	
		4	Ridgetop Phase 3		Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway Phase 1
		5	Ridgetop Phase 4		North Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway
		6		Silverdale Way Phase 3	
		7		Anderson Hill Road, Bucklin to Provost	
		8		Silverdale Way Phase 4	Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway Phase 2
		9		Silverdale Way Phase 5	
		10		Silverdale Way Phase 6	Newberry Hill Roundabout Randall Way Bike Lane

Figure 3. Silverdale TIS Projects and Implementation Timeline

The project costs for the prioritized list of improvements is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Prioritized List of Improvements Project Costs

Priority	Project	Cost				
		PE	ROW	Construction	Total	
1	Ridgetop Phase 1	2.5	1.2	10.0	13.7	
2	Silverdale Way Phase 1 (Bucklin Hill/Silverdale Way Intersection)					
		2nd WB Lane	0.2	0.1	1.2	1.5
		Protected Intersection	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.6
		Access Management	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.7
		Silverdale Way Phase 1 Total	0.4	0.1	2.3	2.8
		Bucklin Hill Gap	0.3	0.4	1.9	2.6
		Phase Totals	0.7	0.5	4.2	5.4

Table 4. Prioritized List of Improvements Project Costs (continued)

Priority	Project	Cost			
		PE	ROW	Construction	Total
3	Ridgetop Phase 2				
	4-Lane under SR 303	0.1	0.0	1.0	1.1
	5-Lane under SR 303	0.8	0.0	5.0	5.8
	Kitsap Mall/Randall				
	Dual EB LT turn Lanes	0.2	0.1	1.0	1.3
	Protected Intersection	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.6
	Kitsap Mall/Randall Totals	0.3	0.1	1.5	1.9
	Phase Totals	1.1	0.1	6.5	7.7
	Ridgetop Phase 3	0.5	1.0	5.6	7.1
	Silverdale Way Phase 2 (Ridgetop/Silverdale Way)				
4	NB Rt Turn Lane	0.1	0.1	0.7	0.9
	Protected Intersection	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.6
	Silverdale Way Phase 2 Totals	0.2	0.1	1.2	1.5
	Central Silverdale Pathway Ph 1*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Phase Totals	0.7	1.1	6.8	8.6	
5	Ridgetop Phase 4	1.3	1.4	14.5	17.2
	North Silverdale Pathway*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Phase Totals	1.3	1.4	14.5	17.2
6	Silverdale Way Phase 3				
	Randall Extension	0.2	1.5	1.2	2.9
	Randall/Bucklin Intersection	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.4
	Randall/SW Intersection	0.5	0.0	1.5	2.0
	Access Management	0.1	0.0	0.6	0.7
	Silverdale Way Complete Street Randall Extension to Bucklin	0.3	0.0	1.7	2.0
Phase Totals	1.2	1.5	5.3	8.0	
7	Anderson Hill from Bucklin to Provost	0.5	0.5	2.0	3.0

Table 4. Prioritized List of Improvements Project Costs (continued)

Priority	Project	Cost			
		PE	ROW	Construction	Total
	Silverdale Way Phase 4				
	Poplars Extension	0.4	0.1	2.5	3.0
	Poplars/KM Boulevard Intersection	0.2	0.2	1.5	1.9
8	Poplars/SW Intersection	0.3	0.5	2.0	2.8
	SW Complete Street Bucklin to Ridgetop Boulevard	0.4	0.0	2.5	2.9
	Central Silverdale Pathway Ph 2*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Phase Totals	1.3	0.8	8.5	10.6
9	Silverdale Way Phase 5 (Anderson Hill to Randall Way Extension)	1.1	0.0	4.8	5.9
	Silverdale Way Complete Street Ridgetop to SR 303				
	Roadway	0.5	0.0	2.8	3.3
	Mall Entrance Roundabout	0.5	0.0	3.0	3.5
	Myhre Roundabout	0.7	0.3	3.0	4.0
10	Randall Way Roundabout	0.5	0.3	2.3	3.1
	Ridgetop to SR 303 Totals	2.2	0.6	11.1	13.9
	Newberry Hill Roundabout	0.3	0.2	1.6	2.1
	Randall Way Bike Lane*	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Phase Totals	2.5	0.8	12.7	16.0

* Note: Asterisk denotes projects that would be funded through developer funds or some combination of private and public funding.

PROJECT DETAILS AND DELIVERY OPTIONS

Ridgetop Corridor Improvements

The Ridgetop Boulevard corridor provides critical access and circulation to east Silverdale for businesses, transit, and employment. Improvement strategies in the corridor include additional roadway capacity, non-motorized, safety, and access management improvements from Silverdale Way to SR 303.

Today, Ridgetop Boulevard carries some of the highest traffic volumes in Silverdale (approximately 18,000 vehicles per day west of SR 303). As a key east-west link between east and west Silverdale, it provides one of three crossings over Clear Creek and provides the only direct connection to SR 303 on the east side of Silverdale.

Three of Kitsap County’s top ten highest accident intersections are in this corridor (Myhre Road, Mickelberry Road, and Silverdale Way intersections). These accidents are primarily driven by congestion and high volume turning movements that occur at these intersections. Corridor traffic volumes are high throughout the day with peaks around noon and again in the 4:00 to 6:00 pm periods, as shown on Figure 4. In addition, peak hour traffic volumes are forecasted to increase in the traditional AM and PM peak hours with the growth of medical services and employment in the Ridgetop Boulevard corridor. Ridgetop Boulevard is also considered a key transit corridor by Kitsap Transit and will provide the primary access to Kitsap Transit’s future transit center located on Ridgetop Boulevard at Sid Uhnick Drive.




Figure 4. Traffic volumes throughout the day at Ridgetop Blvd west of SR 303

Implementation strategies identified in the Ridgetop Boulevard Corridor are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Ridgetop Corridor Implementation Strategies

Strategy	Improvements
Add Roadway Capacity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide 4 traffic lanes + center median for left turns and access management
Improve Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide managed access with left turn/U-turn capability at select intersections
Improve Non-Motorized Connections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide protected intersections • Provide low stress bike lanes • Provide sidewalk and landscaping improvements • Improve connections to the Clear Creek and Markwick trails
Enhance Transit Access	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve access and non-motorized connections to Kitsap Transit’s new transit center
Complete Streets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide landscaping, sidewalk, bike lanes, storm water and utilities

Phased Implementation

A four-phase implementation strategy is envisioned for the Ridgetop Boulevard Corridor to allow for the funding of discrete projects with independent utility over time. The four phases of implementation are shown in Figure 5.


Ridgetop Phase 1

Ridgetop Phase 1 would provide four general purpose traffic lanes with a center median on Ridgetop Boulevard from Mickelberry Road to the realigned Sid Uhnick Drive intersection. The center median would provide access management of the many commercial driveways along Ridgetop Boulevard. Access would be restricted to right turn in/right turn out at all intersections except:

- Mickelberry Road/Ridgetop Boulevard
- Myhre Road/Ridgetop Boulevard
- Midblock Access to Best Buy and Costco

The midblock access to Best Buy and Costco would be signalized with U-turn capability. This signalized midblock intersection would provide important system benefits:

- U-turn and left turn access
- Midblock pedestrian crossing (also important for access to transit stops)
- Protected intersection



<p>Central Hub Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poplars extension, sidewalk, ADA treatments, low stress bike lane • Protected intersections with U-turn and left turn at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Poplars/Kitsap Mall Blvd. (with shared use path) - Poplars/Silverdale • Silverdale/Way Poplars to Ridgetop Complete Streets 	<p>3. Silverdale Way to Blaine</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-Lane Ridgetop with center median access control • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane • Protected intersections with U-turn and left turn at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blaine/Ridgetop - Silverdale/Ridgetop 	<p>4. Blaine to Mickelberry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-Lane Ridgetop with center median access control • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane • Protected intersections with U-turn and left turn at Levin/Ridgetop • New bridge • Clear Creek Trail connections 	<p>1. Mickelberry to Myhre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4-Lane Ridgetop with center median access control • Sidewalk, landscaping, low stress bike lane • Protected intersections with U-turn and left turn at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mickelberry/Ridgetop - Myhre/Ridgetop - Potential New midblock feasibility TBD • Add 2nd EB GP lane and uphill bike lane from Myhre to realigned Sid Uhnick Dr • Storm water, sanitary sewer and utilities 	<p>2a. Realignment of Sid Uhnick Drive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realign Sid Uhnick Drive to align with Harrison Hospital entrance • Add new EB lane on Ridgetop Boulevard <p>2b. New SR 303 Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 to 5 lane, bike lane, sidewalks (w/ WSDOT) • Add dual EB LT and 2 receiving lanes on NB SR 303 on-ramp and dual WB LT off SR 303
--	---	---	---	--

Figure 5. Ridgetop Corridor Phased Implementation Strategies

An important benefit of the midblock intersection is to reduce the southbound left turn demand at the Myhre Road/Ridgetop Boulevard intersection. Without a signalized left turn from the Best Buy/Costco driveways onto Ridgetop Boulevard (heading east to SR 303), high volumes of traffic exit the parking lots from Costco and Best Buy onto Myhre Road to make a signalized left turn from Myhre Road onto Ridgetop Boulevard (heading east to the SR 303 interchange).

Bike lanes on Ridgetop Boulevard would be low stress with some level of vertical and/or horizontal separation from traffic. The bike lanes could be integrated with the sidewalk and landscaping or raised next to the traveled lane. Protected intersections would provide at-grade separation for non-motorized movements. An example of a protected intersection is provided in Figure 6.

Ridgetop Phase 1 Delivery Options

Ridgetop Phase 1 would connect to developer funded improvements on Ridgetop Boulevard from Sid Uhnick Drive to SR 303. Phase 1 improvements provide capacity to accommodate expected growth, improve safety, and ease congestion on this key segment of Ridgetop Boulevard. A critical component of the project is improving and managing the access to the high demand big box retail outlets adjacent to Ridgetop Boulevard. Managing access will improve throughput and safety, and ease congestion. The Phase 1 project provides the foundation for additional improvements in the corridor that will connect to developer funded improvements near Harrison Hospital.



Source: Evolution of the Protected Intersection, 2015 ALTA Planning

Figure 6. Protected Intersection Example

Ridgetop Phase 2

Ridgetop Phase 2 would provide four to five general purpose traffic lanes on Ridgetop Boulevard from the northbound SR 303 on- and off-ramps to the southbound SR 303 on and off-ramps.

Harrison Hospital is constructing an eastbound travel lane and bike lane from east of Myhre to the SR 303 southbound ramp terminal. The improvement will also realign Sid Uhnick Drive to match the hospital access and will include a new signal. The project also includes a westbound bike lane from SR 303 to Mickelberry Road.

Bike lanes on Ridgetop Boulevard would be integrated into the design of the roadway. The Ridgetop improvements will improve non-motorized connections to the transit center, Harrison Hospital and the proposed Markwick trail.

Ridgetop Phase 2 Delivery Options

Ridgetop Phase 2 would complete improvements on Ridgetop Boulevard from Sid Uhnick Drive to SR 303. Phase 2 improvements provide capacity to accommodate expected growth and improve safety and ease congestion from east Silverdale to SR 303. Ridgetop Phase 2 would be implemented in two stages: 2a and 2b (see Figure 5). 2a would consist of the realignment of Sid Uhnick Drive, a new eastbound lane

on Ridgetop and new entrance to Harrison Hospital. 2b would provide improvements to the SR 303 interchange.

A critical component of the stage 2b project is improving the capacity and operation of the SR 303 interchange. There are two options considered for the SR 303 interchange improvements:

1. **Provide a four-lane section between the southbound and northbound SR 303 on-ramps:** The four-lane section would provide a single westbound through lane on Ridgetop Boulevard, two eastbound to northbound left turn lanes on Ridgetop Boulevard at the northbound on-ramp, a single eastbound through lane at the northbound on-ramp, and a single westbound to southbound left turn lane at the southbound on-ramp.




Figure 7. SR 303 Interchange Improvements, Option 1

2. **Provide a five-lane section between the southbound and northbound SR 303 on-ramps:** The five-lane section would provide two westbound through lanes and two northbound to westbound left turn lanes on the SR 303 northbound off-ramp.




Figure 8. SR 303 Interchange Improvements, Option 2

While the four-lane option would not require the widening of the existing roadway, the five-lane option would require roadway widening and modifications to the existing wing walls that support the SR 303 overpass structure. The five-lane option would require modifications to both the northbound off- and on-ramps and may require storm water and utility work. The four-lane option is estimated at \$1.1M while the five-lane option is estimated to cost \$5.8M. Additional study is needed to determine the actual costs of each alternative and identify potential funding sources and partners (i.e., WSDOT). One strategy is to build the less costly four-lane section first until funding is available to build the five-lane option. Since the four-lane option primarily involves restriping the existing pavement, there would be little throw away when the five-lane section is built.

Ridgetop Phase 3

Ridgetop Phase 3 would provide four general purpose traffic lanes on Ridgetop Boulevard from Silverdale Way to Blaine Avenue. Access would be restricted to right turn in/right turn out at all intersections except:

- Silverdale Way/Ridgetop Boulevard
- Blaine Avenue/Ridgetop Boulevard

Protected intersections with U-turn and left turn capabilities would be provided at both Silverdale Way and Blaine Avenue. The improvements would include low stress bike lanes, landscaping and storm water/utility work.

Ridgetop Phase 3 Delivery Options

Ideally, Ridgetop Phase 3 would be constructed before the Central Hub improvements. The Ridgetop Phase 3 improvements would build infrastructure improvements at the Silverdale Way intersection to accommodate the future hub improvements. This would include the protected intersection improvements and the northbound right turn lane. If funding becomes available sooner for the hub intersection improvements at Silverdale Way, the project could be modified to eliminate elements that would be built as part of the hub intersection work.

Ridgetop Phase 4

Ridgetop Phase 4 would provide four general purpose traffic lanes on Ridgetop Boulevard from Blaine Avenue to Mickelberry Road. A critical component of the Phase 4 project is the construction of a new bridge over Clear Creek. Access would be restricted to right turn in/right turn out at all intersections except:

- Blaine Avenue/Ridgetop Boulevard
- Mickelberry Road/Ridgetop Boulevard

A protected intersection with U-turn and left turn capabilities would be provided at Blaine Avenue. The improvements would include low stress bike lanes, landscaping, and connections to the Clear Creek trail system.

Silverdale Way Corridor Improvements

The Silverdale Way corridor is used by autos, bikes, trucks, and transit to access the major retail, business, and residential centers within Silverdale. It is used for trips that are entirely local (walking, biking, and auto trips staying within the Silverdale Regional Center) as well as trips that are passing through Silverdale destined to locations outside of the Regional Center. The two hub intersections on

Silverdale Way experience the highest levels of congestion within Silverdale (LOS E and F). The corridor experiences high volumes of traffic from the Newberry Hill roundabout to the SR 303 interchange (approximately 20,000 vehicles per day south of Bucklin Hill Road and 15,000 vehicles per day north of Ridgetop Boulevard). As the key north-south transportation facility within Silverdale, the improvements recommended for the corridor are focused on providing better circulation and mobility for all modes and improving safety by improving the non-motorized environment and managing access to the many commercial driveways located along the corridor. Phased implementation strategies for the Silverdale Way Corridor are summarized in Figure 9.



Figure 9. Silverdale Way Phased Implementation Strategies

Silverdale Way Phase 1 (South Hub Phase 1 Improvements)

Silverdale Way Phase 1 would implement Phase 1 of the South Hub intersection improvements. The Phase 1 hub improvements would provide a separate westbound through lane on Bucklin Hill Road, protected intersection improvements, and access control from the Safeway driveway signal to Anderson Hill Road (see Figure 10). The extension of Randall Way from Bucklin Hill Road to Silverdale Way would be constructed as part of the South Hub Phase 2 improvements and this project is included in the Silverdale Way Corridor Phase 3 implementation strategy. The Randall Way roadway extension would include low stress bike lanes, sidewalk, landscaping, and utilities work. Upon completion of the South Hub improvements, access would be restricted to right turn in/right turn out on Bucklin Hill Road at all intersections except:

- Silverdale Way/Bucklin Hill Road
- Safeway Driveway/Bucklin Hill Road
- Randall Way/Bucklin Hill Road




Figure 10. South Hub Intersection Improvements

South Hub Delivery Options

The South Hub intersection operates with the highest delays (LOS E) in the Silverdale roadway network. The hub intersection improvements will provide additional capacity and access management to improve throughput and reduce conflicts. The project could be built in phases to provide affordable construction packages that could be funded over a period of years. The completion of the Randall Way extension is needed to complete the intersection improvements and maximize the operations of the Bucklin Hill Road intersection. The project would include pedestrian islands and refuge areas and implement left turn restrictions that will significantly improve the operations of the traffic signal system. Potential phased construction of the South Hub improvements is shown in Figures 11 through 14.



Figure 11. South Hub Implementation Options – Phase 1



Figure 12. South Hub Implementation Options – Phase 2




Figure 13. South Hub Implementation Options – Phase 3



Figure 14. South Hub Implementation Options – Phase 4

Randall Way Extension Delivery Options

The Randall Way roadway extension includes two implementation options as shown in Figure 15.

RANDALL WAY EXTENSION OPTION 1



RANDALL WAY EXTENSION OPTION 2





Figure 15. Randall Way Roadway Extension Options

Option 1 would minimize roadway and right-of-way costs and impacts. The second option would extend Randall Way to the existing pedestrian signal on Silverdale Way. Both options include a new intersection at Randall Way/Silverdale Way. This new intersection would replace the existing pedestrian crosswalk signal on Silverdale Way.

Intersection Control Options

Roundabout and traffic signal intersection control options were evaluated for the South Hub and Central Hub intersections. The results of that analysis are shown in the Figure 16.



Intersection	Circulation						Safety						Non-motorized		Cost		Total Score								
	Signal			Roundabout			Signal			Roundabout			Signal	Roundabout	Signal	Roundabout	Signal	Roundabout							
	raw	+/-	Total	raw	+/-	Total	raw	+/-	Total	raw	+/-	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total	Total							
Ridgetop Way/Silverdale Way	1	0	1	1	+1	2	2	+1	3	1	+1, -1	1	2	3	2	0	8	6							
Poplars Ave/Kitsap Mall Blvd	3	0	3	3	0	3	2	-1	1	3	+1	3	3	3	3	1	10	10							
Poplars Ave/Silverdale Way	1	0	1	3	+1	3	1	-1	0	3	+1	3	3	3	3	1	7	10							
Bucklin Hill Rd/Silverdale Way	1	0	1	0	+1	1	2	0	2	1	+1, -1	1	2	3	2	0	7	5							
Randall Way/Bucklin Hill Rd	2	0	2	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	+1, -1	1	1	3	3	1	8	6							
Randall Way/Silverdale Way	3	0	3	1	+1	2	1	-1	0	3	+1, -1	3	3	3	3	1	9	9							
Point Scale	0	LOS E or F					0	No Improvement					0	No Improvement		0	>\$3M								
	1	LOS D					1	0-15% Improvement					1	Improves one crossing		1	\$2-\$3M								
	2	LOS C					2	15-30% Improvement					2	Improves two or more crossings		2	\$1-\$2M								
	3	LOS A or B					3	>30% Improvement					3	Improves all crossings		3	<\$1M								
Additions and Subtractions	Add 1 point if needed for improved U-Turn capability					Subtract 1 point if improvement increases rear end collisions					Add 1 point if improvement reduces crash severity and injury					Subtract 1 point for negative impact on driver behavior					None				

Figure 16. Hub Intersection Traffic Control Options

Silverdale Way Phase 2 (Central Hub Phase 1 Improvements)

Silverdale Way Phase 2 would implement the first phase of the Central Hub intersection improvements. This would include a dedicated northbound right turn lane from Silverdale Way to Ridgetop Boulevard, and protected intersection improvements. Adding the northbound right turn lane will reduce intersection delays and improve overall intersection operations. The improvements should include a protected refuge area on the southeast corner for pedestrians and bicyclists, as shown on Figure 17.




Figure 17. Central Hub Phase 1: NB Right Turn Lane at Silverdale Way/Ridgetop

Completion of the Central Hub intersection improvements including the extension of Poplars Avenue from Kitsap Mall Boulevard to Silverdale Way would occur during the Silverdale Way Phase 4 work. The Poplars Avenue extension is shown in Figure 18.

Central Hub Delivery Options

Central Hub Phase 1 provides an affordable near-term improvement that provides congestion relief at the Ridgetop Boulevard intersection. It is recommended that the northbound right turn lane be built in concert with the Ridgetop Phase 3 improvements or before Ridgetop Phase 3 due to the increase in traffic volume that is expected on Ridgetop Boulevard with the completion of the Phase 3 improvements. The second phase of the Central Hub improvements would be completed as part of the Silverdale Way Phase 4 improvements and would include the complete streets and access management improvements on Silverdale Way from Bucklin Hill Road to Ridgetop Boulevard. The intersection at Poplars Avenue could be constructed as a signal or roundabout. This intersection provides critical U-turn capability for the implementation of access management on Silverdale Way.



Figure 18. Central Hub Phase 2: Poplars Ave Roadway Extension

Silverdale Way Phase 3 (South Hub Phases 2,3 & 4 and Strawberry Creek to Bucklin Hill Complete Street)

Silverdale Way Phase 3 would construct the Randall Way extension and complete the South Hub Phase 2,3, and 4 improvements as well as implement complete streets on Silverdale Way from Strawberry Creek to Bucklin Hill Road. This project would not include fish passage for Strawberry Creek. The project would include sidewalk, low stress bike lanes, and median access control.

Silverdale Way Phase 4 (Central Hub Phase 2 and Ridgetop Boulevard to Bucklin Hill Complete Street)

Silverdale Way Phase 4 would complete the Central Hub improvements and implement complete streets on Silverdale Way from Ridgetop Boulevard to Bucklin Hill Road. This phase would include the new intersection at Poplars Avenue and Silverdale Way. The project would include sidewalk, low stress bike lanes, and median access control.

Silverdale Way Phase 5 (Anderson Hill to Strawberry Creek Complete Street)

Silverdale Way Phase 5 would implement complete streets on Silverdale Way from Anderson Hill Road to Strawberry Creek. The project would include sidewalk, low stress bike lanes, and median access control, and would include a new culvert for Strawberry Creek underneath Silverdale Way for fish passage.

Silverdale Way Phase 6 (Ridgetop Boulevard to SR 303 Complete Street)

Silverdale Way Phase 6 would implement complete streets on Silverdale Way from Ridgetop Boulevard to SR 303. The project would include sidewalk, low stress bike lanes, and median access control.

Spot Improvements

There are four spot improvements identified in the Silverdale TIS:

1. Bucklin Hill Gap
2. Kitsap Mall/Randall Way Intersection
3. Anderson Hill Road (Bucklin Hill Road to Provost Road)
4. Newberry Hill Road/Silverdale Way Roundabout

Each spot improvement addresses a specific need identified in the Silverdale TIS study.

Bucklin Hill Gap

The Bucklin Hill Gap project completes the five-lane roadway section on Bucklin Hill Road from Mickelberry Road to Myhre Road (see Figure 19). This improvement would include bike lanes, sidewalks, landscaping, storm water, and utilities. This project would extend the improvements completed for the Bucklin Hill Road bridge.




Figure 19. Bucklin Hill Gap Project

The Bucklin Hill Gap project could be constructed in two phases. The first phase would construct the roadway improvements on the south side of the roadway when expected development occurs on the south side of Bucklin Hill. Developer improvements would include the missing sidewalk on the south side of the roadway. The second phase would construct the roadway and sidewalk improvements on the north side of the roadway.

Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Way Intersection

The Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Way intersection project provides a second eastbound left turn lane on Randall Way (see Figure 20). This improvement would include sidewalks, landscaping, storm water, and utilities.




Figure 20. Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Way Intersection Improvements

Anderson Hill Road (Bucklin Hill Road to Provost Road)

The Anderson Hill Road corridor provides a critical connection to Central Kitsap Schools, Provost Road (on the west side of SR 3), and Bucklin Hill Road. It is used as a primary route to and from the Seabeck area and Hood Canal. Traffic volumes on Anderson Hill Road adjacent to the Central Kitsap Schools is forecasted to grow by approximately 20% by 2036. This corridor provides critical access to the Central Kitsap Schools campus. The improvements recommended for the corridor are depicted in Figure 21.




Figure 21. Anderson Hill Road Improvements

Newberry Hill Road/Silverdale Way Roundabout

The primary improvement considered for the Newberry Hill Road/Silverdale Way roundabout is a southbound to westbound slip lane from Silverdale Way to Newberry Hill Road. This improvement would allow this heavy traffic movement to bypass the roundabout reducing conflicts and improving the operation of the roundabout. This improvement will require widening of Newberry Hill from the roundabout to SR 3.

Opportunity Improvements

Opportunity improvements would be funded and implemented through partnerships with developer-initiated projects and/or with Silverdale stakeholders and private interest groups. These improvements include:

1. Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway
2. North Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway
3. Randall Way Bike Lanes

Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway

The Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway would connect the Central Kitsap Schools campus with the Bucklin Hill Road bridge and the Clear Creek trail system. The project could be built in two phases. Phase 1 would connect the Central Kitsap Schools campus to Silverdale Way. The second phase would be built upon completion of the Central Hub intersection improvements, which would include a new intersection at Poplars Avenue and Silverdale Way, providing a protected midblock crossing for bikes and pedestrians across Silverdale Way. A concept for the pathway is shown in Figure 22.




Figure 22. Central Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway Concept

North Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway

The North Silverdale Multi-Use Pathway would connect Randall Way to Myhre Road across Kitsap Mall, Silverdale Way and east Silverdale. A conceptual location for the pathway is shown in Figure 23.

Randall Way Bike Lanes

Randall Way is a lower volume 2-lane roadway with a center turn lane. The proposed project would repurpose the center turn lane for bike lanes (see Figure 23). These could be standard bike lanes with paint or low stress bike lanes depending upon funding.



Figure 23. Randall Way Bike Lanes and Multi-Use Pathway

IMPROVEMENTS CONSIDERED BUT NOT RECOMMENDED

The Silverdale TIS technical analysis evaluated additional roadway capacity improvements to the Silverdale Corridor (from Byron Street to Newberry Hill Road) and for the Randall Way/Myhre Road Corridor (from Kitsap Mall Boulevard to Myhre Road). These improvements are discussed in this section.

Myhre Road Extension to Randall Way

The purpose of the Myhre Road extension analysis was to evaluate the potential for a northern Silverdale corridor improvement to reduce traffic volumes and congestion on Ridgetop Boulevard. Two options were evaluated (see Figure 24). Each option evaluated a new three-lane roadway connecting Myhre Road to Randall Way north of Kitsap Mall.



Figure 24. Myhre Road Extension to Randall Way

The findings for each option are summarized in Table 6. A key conclusion from the analysis was that the Myhre Road Extension to Randall Way would not reduce traffic volumes and congestion on Ridgetop Boulevard.

Table 6. Myhre Road Extension to Randal Way Findings

Alternative	Benefits	Impacts	Ridgetop Corridor
Option 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved localized circulation around Kitsap Mall Minor benefit at Ridgetop Boulevard/Silverdale Way. Modeling shows about a 10% decrease in the SB right turn from Silverdale Way to Kitsap Mall Boulevard. This is not a critical movement at the intersection and the LOS benefits would be minor if any. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adds volume and degrades the LOS at Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Way Separates the north mall parking lot from the mall. Protected midblock pedestrian crossings would be needed for pedestrians crossing the new roadway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not reduce traffic volumes in the Ridgetop corridor
Option 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved localized circulation around the north edge of Kitsap Mall Reduced volume on Myhre in the vicinity of Silverdale Way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant impact to wetlands east of Silverdale Way Minor impact to the LOS at Kitsap Mall Boulevard/Randall Way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not reduce traffic volumes in the Ridgetop corridor

Four-Lane Silverdale Way South of Byron Street

The purpose of the four-lane Silverdale Way South of Byron Street analysis was to evaluate the traffic benefits and impacts of improving Silverdale Way from two lanes to four lanes between Newberry Hill Road and Bryon Street (see Figure 25). The analysis assumed a four-lane roadway from the SR 3/ Newberry Hill Road interchange to the Silverdale Way/Byron Street intersection.



Figure 25. 4-Lane Silverdale Way South of Byron Street

This project attracted significantly higher traffic volumes onto the Silverdale Way Corridor, resulting in poor operating level-of-service (LOS F) at key intersections, such as Bucklin Hill Road and Ridgetop Boulevard. Due to the potential impacts on circulation within Silverdale, this improvement was given a low priority with the understanding that additional study and analysis is needed to fully understand the benefits and tradeoffs. The key findings of the analysis included:

1. A 4-lane Silverdale Way improvement will make Silverdale Way a more attractive entry into Silverdale, attracting higher traffic volumes onto the corridor. The resulting increased congestion is likely to impede internal circulation within Silverdale, particularly at key hub intersections such as Silverdale Way/Bucklin Hill and Silverdale Way/Ridgetop Boulevard.
2. Additional study is needed to understand the potential tradeoffs and impacts including the potential need and benefits of improvements at the SR 3/Newberry Hill interchange and at the Newberry Hill/Provost Road intersection to reducing queuing and congestion.