

Chapter 1.0 | Summary



1.1 Introduction

This section provides a summary of the City's proposals, alternatives, and environmental evaluation.

1.1.1 Overview of the Proposal

The City of Poulsbo is updating the Poulsbo Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan ("the comprehensive plan") consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA; [RCW 36.70A](#)). The comprehensive plan is designed to help the City meet its long-term vision for land use and growth management. The comprehensive plan:

- allocates population, and employment growth to various areas of the county, with a majority of growth occurring in Urban Growth Areas (UGAs);
- reduces sprawl in rural areas and maintains rural character;
- addresses housing needs of all economic segments of the population;
- supports economic development;
- protects open space, cultural, and scenic resources;
- provides for parks, recreation, and capital facilities and utilities; and
- develops a multimodal transportation network necessary to serve the population and employment.

In accordance with GMA, the 2024 Update addresses and 2044 horizon year, and considers new population, housing and job targets, changes to the future Land Use map, a fair share of affordable housing, housing policy amendments to address racially disparate impacts, and supporting investments in parks and multimodal/active transportation, utilities and public services. The comprehensive plan is also required to be consistent with the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs), and with regional plans such as the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC's) Vision 2050 which contains the Multi-County Planning Policies (MPPs).

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIS or DEIS) studies four land use and growth alternatives that include a no action and three action alternatives for the city and UGA. All three alternatives assume growth consistent with [PSRC's Vision 2050](#) and [Appendix B and F of the Kitsap CPPs](#): 5,646 new persons, 4,000 new jobs and 1,977 new housing units.

The following is a summary of the alternatives studied:

- 1) **Alternative 1 – No Action, Current Adopted Plan:** This alternative assumes no changes to the future land use designations currently shown on the City's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and there will be no policy, zoning or regulation changes associated with this alternative. This alternative is required under SEPA.
- 2) **Alternative 2 – Adopted Plan + Missing Middle Housing Emphasis:** This strategy will focus on adding policies and development regulation amendments that would promote missing middle housing within the residential zoning districts. Examples of Missing Middle Housing that would be considered in zoning regulations are reduced minimum lot sizes; attached units (duplex, triplex, etc.) allowed in Residential Low zoning districts; infill; multiplex buildings; town or rowhouses; accessory dwelling units; and cottage/courtyard developments.
- 3) **Alternative 3 – Growth focused within SR 305 Corridor Center:** This alternative would evaluate the C-3 Commercial zone for opportunities to increase residential development along an existing transit corridor, while also maintaining a vital employment area. There are opportunities for development within this area and future code amendments may include increased building height, reduced parking requirements, and other incentives. A substantial portion of the population and new jobs will be assigned to this alternative. Residential designations and densities (Residential Low, Residential Medium and Residential High) remains the same as Alternative 1 Current Adopted Plan and includes Alternative 2 Missing Middle Emphasis.
- 4) **Alternative 4 – Growth focused within SR 305 Corridor Center and increase to density in Residential Medium and Residential High zoning districts:** This alternative would include the SR 305 Corridor Center evaluation and add increased densities to the City's Residential Medium (RM) and Residential High (RH) zoning districts. RM density would increase from 6-10 units/acre to 6-14 units/acre; and RH would increase from 11-14 units/acre to 15-22 units/acre. Residential Low (4-5 unit/acre) remains the same as currently adopted.

1.1.2 Study Area

The primary study area includes all of the City of Poulsbo and associated unincorporated urban growth area Centrally located in North Kitsap County, Poulsbo is served by three state highways: SR 3, SR 307, and SR 305. Poulsbo's natural setting has highly recognizable characteristics that define the city as a unique and special place. Encompassing 5.36 square miles, Poulsbo has numerous hills and valleys, streams, and frontage on the waters of Liberty Bay. Elevations range from sea level

to 440 feet, with two ridges running along each side of Liberty Bay, which gradually rise in elevation and merge to the north. The western leg of the ridge slopes gradually towards Liberty Bay, while the eastern leg slopes in a broken pattern of knolls, valleys, and benches to the eastern shore of the Bay. Liberty Bay and the Liberty Bay Estuary are the two major bodies of water in Poulsbo. Relatively narrow and shallow, the bay serves as the receiving waters for Dogfish Creek, as well as a number of other streams at the edges of the city limits. Dogfish Creek is the largest stream system in Poulsbo and extends extensively outside of the city limits. The South Fork of Dogfish Creek is completely within the city limits, on the east side of Poulsbo, generally along the SR 305 corridor.

1.1.3 Land Acknowledgment

Every part of this soil is sacred in the estimation of my people. Every hillside, every valley, every plain and grove, has been hallowed by some sad or happy event in days long vanished.” - Chief Seattle 1854

We would like to begin by acknowledging that the land on which we gather is within the ancestral territory of the suq̓ʷabs̓ “People of Clear Salt Water” (Suquamish People). Expert fisherman, canoe builders and basket weavers, the suq̓ʷabs̓ live in harmony with the lands and waterways along Washington’s Central Salish Sea as they have for thousands of years. Here, the suq̓ʷabs̓ live and protect the land and waters of their ancestors for future generations as promised by the Point Elliot Treaty of 1855.

1.1.4 Objectives

SEPA requires a statement of proposal objectives and the purpose and need to which the proposal is responding. Alternatives are different means of achieving objectives. The objectives of the Poulsbo Comprehensive Plan 2024 Update include the following:

- Address state and regional goals and requirements.
- Comply with comprehensive plan periodic review requirements to meet state laws including changes to the GMA since the last periodic review and to align with the regional growth strategy in the PSRC VISION 2050.
- Demonstrate capacity to accommodate housing and jobs growth targets through 2044.
- Meet legislative requirements and countywide planning policies for affordable housing and housing types
- Provide a variety of employment opportunities and commercial services for Poulsbo residents and visitors.
- Support economic development and business for prosperous community and economic vitality.
- Support transit, non-motorized and other alternative transportation modes through appropriate housing choices, employment opportunities, and multimodal transportation infrastructure.
- Ensure that public services, multimodal transportation infrastructure and capital facilities can be efficiently and effectively provided to support forecast development at appropriate levels of service.
- Enhance access to parks, recreation, and cultural amenities.

1.2 SEPA Process

1.2.1 Overview

Under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), agencies conduct environmental review of actions that could affect the environment – including policy and regulation changes (considered non-project actions). Preparation of an EIS is required for actions that have potentially significant impacts so that the public, agencies, Tribes, and City decision-makers have information about the environmental effects of changes before a decision is made.

See the graphic below for an overview of the EIS process. The DEIS is part of Phase 2. The EIS evaluates alternative approaches to growing the City’s population, employment, and housing capacity. The city will review comments and select a preferred alternative (Phase 3) before moving on to the Final EIS phase (Phase 4).

Exhibit 1.2.1-1: Comprehensive Plan EIS Process Timeline



1.2.2 Scoping

The scoping process is intended to identify the range of potential significant impacts on the built and natural environment that should be considered and evaluated in the EIS. The City issued a Scoping Notice on April 14, 2023, with a 45-day public comment period that ran through May 29, 2023. Scoping comments are included with this DEIS as an appendix.

1.2.3 Draft EIS

This DEIS identifies environmental conditions, potential impacts, and measures to reduce or mitigate any unavoidable adverse impacts that could result from the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. The DEIS alternatives and topics were developed based on a review of scoping comments and prior engagement results. This DEIS evaluates each of the following topics for the four alternatives:

Natural Environment

- Earth
- Air Quality
- Water Resources (Surface Water and Groundwater)
- Fish, Wildlife, Plants

Built Environment

- Land and Shoreline Use
- Plans & Policies
- Population, Housing & Employment
- Transportation
- Cultural and Historic Resources
- Public Services and Utilities

Public and agency comments are invited on this DEIS. Written and verbal comments are invited during the 30-day public comment period following issuance of this DEIS. Public comments will be considered and addressed in the Final EIS. Please see the Fact Sheet at the beginning of this Draft EIS for the dates of the public comment period.

1.2.4 Final EIS

A Final EIS will be issued in 2025 and will include responses to public comments received during the DEIS comment period. Following the EIS process, the Comprehensive Plan will be the subject of public meetings and public hearings by the Planning Commission and City Council.

1.2.5 Phased Review

Phased review of the proposal pursuant to WAC 197-11-060(5) is anticipated. Phased review assists agencies and the public to focus on issues that are ready for decision and exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ready. In phased review, broader environmental documents, such as the EIS for this proposal, may be followed by narrower documents that incorporate prior general discussion by reference and concentrate solely on the issues specific to that phase of the proposal.

1.3 Alternatives

1.3.1 Alternative 1, No Action

This alternative assumes no changes to the future land use designations currently shown on the City's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, and there will be no policy, zoning or regulation changes associated with this alternative. Current zoning continues the current Future Land Use Map and zoning. Exhibit 2.4.2-2 maps the future land use designations and zoning as Alternative 1. Exhibit 1.3.1-1 summarizes the employment, population, and housing capacity by land use category.

Alternative 1 No Action assumes growth consistent with available buildable land capacity. Net growth would equal:

- Employment: 4,165 new jobs between 2024-2044
- Population: 6,022 new people between 2024-2044
- Housing: 2,578 new housing units¹ between 2024-2044

¹ For all Alternatives, the household size for single family and multifamily as set forth in the Kitsap County 2021 Buildable Lands Report was used to calculate housing unit capacity. Population/Household size = capacity. Single Family = 2.51 household size; Multi Family = 2.09 household size. SF household size was applied for RL zoning; MF household size applied for all other zoning districts.

| Exhibit 1.3.1-1: Alternative 1 - No Action Current Plan | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Land Use Category | Employment Capacity | Population Capacity | Housing Unit Capacity |
| Residential Low | 0 | 3,795 | 1,512 |
| Residential Medium | 0 | 1,233 | 590 |
| Residential High | 0 | 994 | 476 |
| C-1 Downtown/Front Street | 221 | 0 | 0 |
| C-2 Viking Avenue | 604 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 SR 305 Corridor | 1,954 | 0 | 0 |
| C-4 College Marketplace | 348 | 0 | 0 |
| Office Commercial Industrial | 435 | 0 | 0 |
| Business Park | 441 | 0 | 0 |
| Light Industrial | 162 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,165 | 6,022 | 2,578 |
| <i>KRCC Growth Allocation</i> | <i>4,000</i> | <i>5,646</i> | <i>1,977</i> |
| <i>Surplus/Deficit</i> | <i>+165</i> | <i>+376</i> | <i>+601</i> |

1.3.2 Alternative 2, Current Plan + Missing Middle Housing Emphasis

This alternative assumes no changes to the future land use designations currently shown on the City’s Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, but there will be policy, zoning or regulation changes associated with this alternative. Exhibit 2.4.2-2 maps the future land use designations and zoning for Alternative 2 as well.

Alternative 2 Current Plan + Missing Middle Housing Emphasis assumes the City and UGA grow consistently with available buildable land capacity, and additional land capacity could be realized due to modifications to the City’s zoning ordinance which would remove barriers and incentive missing middle housing types. Amendments identified include reduced minimum lot sizes for single family detached; increased opportunities for attached units (duplex, triplex, fourplex) allowed in Residential Low zoning districts; infill density bonus; multiuse buildings; town or rowhouses; accessory dwelling units; and cottage/courtyard developments. Table 1.3.2-1 summarizes the employment, population, and housing capacity by land use category.

Net growth would equal:

- Employment: 4,165 new jobs between 2024-2044
- Population: 6,201 new people between 2024-2044
- Housing: 2,649 new housing units between 2024-2044

| Exhibit 1.3.2-1: Alternative 2 - Current Plan + Missing Middle Housing Emphasis | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Land Use Category | Employment Capacity | Population Capacity | Housing Unit Capacity |
| Residential Low | 0 | 3974 | 1583 |
| Residential Medium | 0 | 1233 | 590 |
| Residential High | 0 | 994 | 476 |
| C-1 Downtown/Front Street | 221 | 0 | 0 |
| C-2 Viking Avenue | 604 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 SR 305 Corridor | 1954 | 0 | 0 |
| C-4 College Marketplace | 348 | 0 | 0 |
| Office Commercial Industrial | 435 | 0 | 0 |
| Business Park | 441 | 0 | 0 |
| Light Industrial | 162 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4165 | 6201 | 2649 |
| <i>KRCC Growth Allocation</i> | <i>4,000</i> | <i>5,646</i> | <i>1,977</i> |
| <i>Surplus/Deficit</i> | <i>+165</i> | <i>+555</i> | <i>+672</i> |

1.3.3 Alternative 3, Growth focused within SR 305 Corridor Center

This alternative assumes changes to the future land use designations currently shown on the City’s Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, as well as policy, zoning and regulation changes associated with this alternative. Exhibit 2.4.4-2 maps the future land use designation and zoning for Alternative 3, identifying a SR 305 Corridor Center.

Alternative 3 SR 305 Corridor Center assumes the City and UGA grow consistently with available buildable land capacity, and additional population capacity would be realized due to modifications to the City's zoning ordinance which would increase residential development within the SR 305 transit corridor. Amendments identified include increased building height, reduced parking requirements, and other incentives.

Alternative 3 assumes residential designations and densities remain the same as Alternative 1 Current Adopted Plan while also including Alternative 2 Missing Middle Emphasis capacity increase in the RL zoning district. Exhibit 1.3.3-1 summarizes the employment, population, and housing capacity by land use category.

Net growth would equal:

- Employment: 4,099 new jobs between 2024-2044
- Population: 7,270 new people between 2024-2044
- Housing: 3,161 new housing units between 2024-2044

| Exhibit 1.3.3-1: Alternative 3 - SR 305 Corridor Center | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Land Use Category | Employment Capacity | Population Capacity | Housing Unit Capacity |
| Residential Low | 0 | 3,974 | 1,583 |
| Residential Medium | 0 | 1,233 | 590 |
| Residential High | 0 | 994 | 476 |
| C-1 Downtown/Front Street | 118 | 269 | 129 |
| C-2 Viking Avenue | 604 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 SR 305 Corridor | 1,991 | 800 | 383 |
| C-4 College Marketplace | 348 | 0 | 0 |
| Office Commercial Industrial | 435 | 0 | 0 |
| Business Park | 441 | 0 | 0 |
| Light Industrial | 162 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,099 | 7,270 | 3,161 |
| <i>KRCC Growth Allocation</i> | <i>4,000</i> | <i>5,646</i> | <i>1,977</i> |
| <i>Surplus/Deficit</i> | <i>+99</i> | <i>+1,624</i> | <i>+1,184</i> |

Alternative 3 assumes additional 800 persons and 383 new housing units in the C-3/SR 305 Corridor zoning district, based upon the mixed-use methodology assumptions set forth in the Kitsap County Buildable Lands Report.² A little over 100 new housing units is also assumed in the C-1 Downtown/Front Street zoning district under this Alternative due to its close proximity to the SR 305 Corridor Center and recent mixed use developments.

1.3.4 Alternative 4, SR 305 Corridor Center and Increase Density in Residential Medium and Residential High Zoning Districts

Alternative 4 includes the SR 305 Corridor Center increased capacity assumptions and adds increased density to the Residential Medium (RM) and Residential High (RH) zoning districts by increasing the maximum density range. RM density would increase from 6-10 units/acre to 6-14 units/acre; and RH would increase from 11-14 units/acre to 15-22 units/acre. Residential Low (4-5 unit/acre) remains the same as currently adopted.

This alternative assumes changes to the future land use designations currently shown on the City's Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, as well as policy, zoning and regulation changes associated with this alternative. Exhibit 2.4.5-2 maps the future land use designation and zoning for Alternative 4, identifying a SR 305 Corridor Center and increased residential density ranges for the RM/RH zoning districts. Alternative 4 also continues to include Alternative 2 Missing Middle Emphasis capacity increase in the RL zoning district.

Exhibit 1.3.4-1 summarizes the employment, population, and housing capacity by land use category.

Net growth would equal:

- Employment: 4,099 new jobs between 2024-2044
- Population: 7,961 new people between 2024-2044
- Housing: 3,491 new housing units between 2024-2044

² Kitsap BLR establishes methodology to calculate jobs and population capacity for mixed use buildings. For the Alternative 3 C-3 SR 305 Corridor capacity calculation, the following was assumed: 60/40 split for population/jobs, 1.5 FAR, 35 du/acre and only included vacant properties.

| Exhibit 1.3.4-1: Alternative 4 - SR 305 Corridor Center + RM/RH density range increase | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Land Use Category | Employment Capacity | Population Capacity | Housing Unit Capacity |
| Residential Low | 0 | 3,974 | 1,583 |
| Residential Medium | 0 | 1,601 | 766 |
| Residential High | 0 | 1,317 | 630 |
| C-1 Downtown/Front Street | 118 | 269 | 129 |
| C-2 Viking Avenue | 604 | 0 | 0 |
| C-3 SR 305 Corridor | 1991 | 800 | 383 |
| C-4 College Marketplace | 348 | 0 | 0 |
| Office Commercial Industrial | 435 | 0 | 0 |
| Business Park | 441 | 0 | 0 |
| Light Industrial | 162 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4,099 | 7,961 | 3,491 |
| <i>KRCC Growth Allocation</i> | <i>4,000</i> | <i>5,646</i> | <i>1,977</i> |
| <i>Surplus/Deficit</i> | <i>+99</i> | <i>+2,315</i> | <i>+1,514</i> |

1.3.5 Comparison of Alternatives

| Table 1.3.5-1: Comparison of Alternatives Studied in Draft EIS | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Features | Alternative 1 No Action | Alternative 2 Missing Middle | Alternative 3 SR 305 Corridor Center | Alternative 4 SR 305 Corridor Center + RM/RH Density Increases |
| Vision 2050 Growth Strategy | Population and employment growth targets can be accommodated. | Population and employment growth targets can be accommodated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population and employment growth targets can be accommodated. Identifies a Center with intensive mixed use and housing options around transit. Active transportation and transit reliability. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population and employment growth targets can be accommodated. Identifies a Center with intensive mixed use and housing options around transit. Active transportation and transit reliability. |
| Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies | Population, employment, and housing growth targets can be accommodated. | Population, employment, and housing growth targets can be accommodated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population, employment, and housing growth targets can be accommodated. Identifies a Center with intensive mixed use and housing options around transit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Population, employment, and housing growth targets can be accommodated. Identifies a Center with intensive mixed use and housing options around transit. |
| Population Capacity | 6,022 new people | 6,201 new people | 7,270 new people | 7,961 new people |
| Employment Capacity | 4,165 new jobs | 4,165 new jobs | 4,099 new jobs | 4,099 new jobs |
| Housing Capacity | 2,578 new units | 2,649 new units | 3,161 new units | 3,491 new units |
| Housing Diversity | No change | Wider variety of typologies in single family neighborhoods | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wider variety of typologies in single family neighborhoods Mixed use residential and intensive housing options within SR 305 Corridor Center. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wider variety of typologies in single family neighborhoods Mixed use residential and intensive housing options within SR 305 Corridor Center. Increase residential density ranges for Residential Medium and Residential High zoning districts. |
| Housing Income Needs | 0-80% AMI -663 | 0-80% AMI -368 | 0-80% AMI +143 | 0-80% AMI +386 |
| Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements | Capital Facilities and Transportation Element with updated inventories, forecast of future needs. | Capital Facilities and Transportation Element with updated inventories, forecast of future needs. | Capital Facilities and Transportation Element with updated inventories, forecast of future needs. | Capital Facilities and Transportation Element with updated inventories, forecast of future needs. |
| Development Regulations | Retains current zoning and housing type regulations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retains current zoning Amends development regulations to allow for variety of housing types in RL zoning district | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends land use and zoning map to identify a SR 305 Corridor Center. Amends development regulations to allow variety of housing types in RL zoning district. Amends development regulations to allow for mixed use in SR 305 Corridor Center, and other amendments to prioritize multi-story mixed use buildings. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amends land use and zoning map to identify a SR 305 Corridor Center; and to increase density ranges for RM/RH districts. Amends development regulations to allow variety of housing types in RL zoning district; and increase density ranges for RM/RH districts. Amends development regulations to allow for mixed use in SR 305 Corridor Center, and other amendments to prioritize multi-story mixed use buildings. |

1.4 Options and Key Issues

All alternatives result in increased population, housing and growth that will lead to some unavoidable changes to the natural environment, land use, housing, transportation, and capital improvements. Prior to the development of the Final EIS, the following issues are anticipated to be resolved:

- Selection and refinement if identified of the City's preferred alternative
- Ability to provide more efficient growth patterns that support multimodal travel
- Providing housing capacity for all income levels
- Level and cost of parks, transportation, capital improvements needed to support land use and growth levels

1.5 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section summarizes the results of the Alternatives evaluation in Chapter 3.

1.5.1 Natural Environment

1.5.1.1 Earth

How did we analyze Earth?

Earth was analyzed by reviewing mapped soils and geologic hazard areas in the city relative to growth patterns anticipated under each alternative. Potential impacts to earth and soils resources were considered under the framework of regulatory protection, including geologic hazards like erosion, landslides, and earthquake. The thresholds of significance include:

- Increased risk of flooding, erosion, and landslides through increased use of vulnerable lands
- Increased risk of a geologic hazard that exposes population to injury or substantial property damage
- Increased development intensity could impact earth resources

What impacts did we identify?

The impacts of geologic hazards on new and infill development and redevelopment throughout Poulsbo due to population and job growth were evaluated for this analysis. New, infill and redevelopment residential, commercial and business construction, road improvements and utility installation will involve land clearing, fill, excavation, grading and alteration of drainage that may potentially affect the earth environment in a variety of ways:

- The removal of vegetation may decrease habitat value, reduce wind buffering, alter light and glare, increase surface temperature fluctuations, diminish rainwater storage, change hydrologic characteristics, require burning or other disposal, affect soil stability and structure.
- Placement of earth fill may alter topography, create unstable side slopes, destabilize hill slopes, alter subsurface and surface drainage, create ponding, contaminate groundwater, damage root systems, require disposal sites, and accelerate erosion.
- Temporary grading and construction activities may result in a combination of impacts typical of earth fills and excavation depending on the degree of the cut and/or fill but will always disrupt the soil surface and therefore likely result in increased erosion potential.
- Altered drainage from land disturbance activity may result in a destabilized drainage network. Accelerated runoff or diversion of drainage from one system to another may result in the temporary or prolonged overburdening of channel carrying capacity, causing scouring of stream banks, possible flooding and downstream sediment deposition.
- An increase in impervious surfaces may result in changes to surface water and ground water quality and quantity.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

All alternatives would increase population growth that could be exposed directly (e.g., homes built prior to critical area regulations) or indirectly (e.g., roads, stormwater systems) to geologic hazard areas such as erosion and landslide hazard areas; these areas could be more susceptible to climate exacerbated hazards. Impacts under all alternatives are presumed to be no or low impact. Alternatives 3 and 4, due to the prevalence of slopes in the SR 305 Corridor, is identified as potential moderate impact with increased development.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Increased risk of a geologic hazard that exposes population to injury or substantial property damage | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Increased development intensity that could impact localized earth resources | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊕ | ⊕ |
| Erosion that is likely to not be contained on future development sites | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ⊗ Moderate impact ⊕ High impact ⊕ ⊕ | | | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

Geologically hazardous area impacts under all alternatives would be regulated under the GMA and Poulsbo Municipal Code. In addition to the existing Natural Environment Element policies and the regulations of geologically hazardous areas in Poulsbo’s Critical Areas Ordinance (PMC Chapter 16.20) the following measures would address identified earth impacts:

- Although avoidance is the best strategy, structural and engineering solutions can mitigate geologic hazards. Per PMC 16.20.760, geologic studies must be prepared by a qualified consultant. Third party peer review should continue to be applied to all geotechnical studies and any proposed alterations.
- Implementation of recommendations from geotechnical engineering studies.
- Best management practices during construction combined with adherence to DOE Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.
- Applicable regulations, practices or planning efforts:
 - PMC Title 18, Zoning
 - PMC 16.20, Critical Areas Ordinance
 - PMC 15.35, Tree Cutting and Clearing Ordinance
 - PMC 15.40, Grading Ordinance
 - PMC 15.04, City Construction Code and Building Code
 - Kitsap County Multi-Hazard Mitigation Plan, 2019
 - Federal National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulations and PMC 13.17

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Existing regulations in the Poulsbo Municipal Code for the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of geologically hazardous areas are expected to mitigate potential impacts to less than significant levels under all alternatives. Many earth-related impacts, such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and landslides, are unavoidable natural events and can have significant adverse consequences. Mitigation cannot fully prevent these events and associated impacts, but Poulsbo has developed mapping, regulations and planning that provide the public with valuable information to inform decision making permitting. As such, while all alternatives will result in localized areas that could experience earth-related impacts, sufficient planning tools and resources are available to prevent significant unavoidable adverse impacts under the proposed alternatives.

1.5.1.2 Air Quality

How did we analyze Air Quality?

Air quality impacts would primarily be associated with construction activity, residential wood burning and vehicle traffic. Dust from excavation and grading and use of construction equipment would contribute to the ambient concentrations of suspended particulate matter and short-term odors on a localized basis.

Wood-burning appliances (wood stoves, fireplace/inserts) can cause elevated concentrations of air pollutants during periods of poor dispersion. Residential development, therefore, can represent a source of carbon monoxide and respirable particulate matter. The use of lower emission fuels than wood can reduce the level of impact attributed to new development. The PSCAA often bans the use of wood burning in times of poor air quality.

Automobile emissions are one of the greatest contributors to declining air quality. Emissions associated with motor vehicles include hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxides. These emissions would tend to increase along with population growth, vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion.

Three agencies have jurisdiction over the ambient air quality are the EPA, Ecology, and PSCAA. These agencies establish regulations that govern both the allowable concentrations of pollutants in the outdoor air and allowable contaminant

emissions from air pollution sources. These thresholds are based on the concentrations of pollutants in the air, and they help to identify when air pollution may be reaching levels that could harm human health or the environment.

What impacts did we identify?

Common impacts to air quality that would occur under all alternatives include: (1) emissions from construction of infrastructure or private projects, including changes to land use, (2) emissions from increased traffic due to population and employment growth (which would continue to be the single largest air pollutant source category), and (3) exposure to particulate matter from wildfire smoke.

Dust from excavation and grading and use of construction equipment would contribute to the ambient concentrations of suspended particulate matter and short-term odors on a localized basis.

Wood-burning appliances (wood stoves, fireplace/inserts) can cause elevated concentrations of air pollutants during periods of poor dispersion. Residential development, therefore, can represent a source of carbon monoxide and respirable particulate matter. The use of lower emission fuels than wood can reduce the level of impact attributed to new development. The PSCAA often bans the use of wood burning in times of poor air quality.

Automobile emissions are one of the greatest contributors to declining air quality. Emissions associated with motor vehicles include hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxides. These emissions would tend to increase along with population growth, vehicle miles traveled and traffic congestion.

Under all the alternatives, wildfire smoke would continue to be a concern. There have been days with moderate and poor air quality in recent years, which is connected to the rise in the number of wildfires in the region, and the smoke and particulate matter they produce. It is important to note that the city has no control over wildfires, which frequently has an impact on the air quality within Kitsap County.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

Under all four alternatives, the city would see growth that would increase Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions. All alternatives promote population, housing and employment growth within the city limits and urban growth area consistent with GMA and PSRC Vision 2050, where there are multimodal approaches to transportation and a variety of residential, commercial, and industrial land uses.

While impacts among the four alternatives would vary because all alternatives support slightly different population growth strategies, there are several common impacts to air quality that would occur under all alternatives: (1) emissions from construction of infrastructure or private projects, including changes to land use, (2) emissions from increased traffic due to population and employment growth (which would continue to be the single largest air pollutant source category), and (3) exposure to particulate matter from wildfire smoke. Alternatives 3 and 4 concentrate residential housing and job growth within the City’s SR-305 Corridor Center. Multimodal transportation options and opportunities are planned to support the Center, reducing single-occupancy vehicular usage. It is anticipated that emissions from single-occupancy vehicles could reduce due to the Centers-focused growth and accessibility to multimodal transportation options.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Causes localized air quality to exceed the national Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQSs) | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ⊗ Moderate impact ⊕ High impact ⊕ ⊕ | | | | |

What are some mitigations for impacts?

Incorporated Comprehensive Plan policies within the Natural Environment and Transportation Chapters include:

- Supporting reduction of greenhouse gases through land use patterns that support Centers-focused
- Multimodal and active transportation planning and implementation
- Improved access to transit centers by active transportation facilities
- Coordination and collaboration with other government agencies to develop and implement strategies to address climate change and greenhouse gas reduction
- Support alternative energy sources
- Reduction of vehicle miles traveled
- Protect natural resources that sequester and store carbon



Applicable Regulations or Authorities include:

- EPA, Washington State Department of Ecology and Puget Sound Clean Air Agency jurisdictional authority
- Washington State Clean Energy Transformation Act, 2019
- Motor Vehicle Emissions Standards, 2020
- Washington State Climate Commitment Act, 2021
- Washington State Clean Fuel Standard Act, 2021
- Hydrofluorocarbons Emissions Reduction, 2021
- Washington State HB 1181, 2023
- Regional Greenhouse Reduction Goals

At the local level, mitigating measures include: 1) Construction impacts may be reduced with the requirement for dust suppression in the forms of containment via suspended plastic sheeting, watering dry dirt roads and work areas, and suspending work during windy or extremely dry periods; 2) Encourage home heating with wood burning appliances to optimize energy efficiency and cleanliness. Prohibition of wood burning appliances in high-density areas may be appropriate; 3) Zoning regulations that encourage mixed-use pedestrian and transit-oriented neighborhoods may help reduce reliance on vehicles; 4) Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies promoting multi-modal and alternative transportation options, such as walking, bicycling, riding transit, carpooling, and working from home can be implemented to enhance the capacity of the transportation network and reduce vehicle emissions.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

The development and growth associated with the alternatives would likely result in increased air pollution and greenhouse gases. Alternative 1 and 2 are expected to have the highest amount of such impacts due to its dispersed growth approach, Alternative 3 and 4 would have the least number of impacts due to concentrated nature of development and multimodal travel opportunities. Compliance with applicable federal and state regulations and policies will provide mitigation for each alternative. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to air quality are expected.

1.5.1.3 Water Resources (Surface Water and Groundwater)

How did we analyze Water Resources?

Water resources impacts would primarily be associated with construction activity and thresholds for analysis included reduction of water quality/increases surface runoff, loss of wetland and stream habitat, and reduction of groundwater recharge.

What impacts did we identify?

Streams, wetlands, frequently flooded areas, and critical aquifer recharge areas are located throughout the city, and all alternatives could have impacts on these resources if development occurs in proximity to these resources. The development growth associated with every alternative would likely result in increased hard surfaces, increased vehicle use, and decreased vegetation, all of which can negatively impact surface water resources. Also, impaired waters exist throughout the city and future development or redevelopment around impaired waters could provide an opportunity to improve water quality through improved stormwater treatment compared to what currently exists. Finally, construction activities associated with development and redevelopment can involve removal of vegetation and soil disturbance, causing potential erosion and water quality impacts.

Impaired waters exist throughout the city, and future development or redevelopment around impaired waters could provide an opportunity to improve water quality through improved stormwater treatment compared to what currently exists.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

All alternatives would allow for growth. Growth under Alternatives 1 and 2 will focus more housing growth on existing lots whereas Alternative 3 and 4 focuses growth within the SR 305 corridor center. Growth under Alternative 1 is more dispersed than Alternatives 2, 3, and 4. Therefore, Alternative 1 is more likely to have a greater negative impact on drainage basins conditions and water resources as growth would not be optimized within a center with higher densities.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Reduces water quality or increases surface runoff | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Loss of wetland and stream habitat | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Reduces groundwater recharge | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ✘ Moderate impact + High impact ++ | | | | |

What are some mitigations for impacts?

Incorporated Comprehensive Plan policies within the Natural Environment Chapter include:

- Maintaining the City’s critical areas regulations and utilizing best available science as required by GMA
- Minimizing impacts on natural systems
- Preserving and protecting natural surface water storage sites
- Preserving and protecting fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas
- Protecting groundwater resources and well heads
- Support Low Impact Development and Best Management techniques and strategies
- Coordinate planning and protection of critical areas and habitat with other local agencies and Tribes.
- Apply Shoreline Master Program policies and regulations

Specific measures to mitigate impacts to water resources are included in the following regulations:

Local

- Stormwater Management - PMC Chapter 13.17
- Floodplain Management - PMC Chapter 15.24
- Illicit Discharge Detection and Elimination - PMC Chapter 13.18
- Critical Areas Regulations - PMC Chapter 16.20
- Shoreline Master Program - PMC Chapter 16.08
- Project-level SEPA Review - PMC Chapter 16.04
- Watershed Restoration and Enhancement Plan – WRIA 15 (2022)

State

- Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters
- Water Quality Standards for Groundwater
- Flood Control Management Act
- Water Pollution Control Act
- Shoreline Management Act
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction Stormwater General Permit
- NPDES Western Washington Phase I and Phase II Municipal Stormwater General Permits
- Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington
- WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual
- WSDOT Hydraulics Manual
- Washington State Hydraulic Code

Federal

- Clean Water Act Section 404
- Coastal Zone Management Act
- Section 14 of the Rivers and Harbors Act
- National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 and Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973
- Floodplain Management Presidential Executive Order 11988
- Endangered Species Act (ESA) Biological Opinion for the Implementation of the National Flood
- Safe Drinking Water Act

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

Other potential mitigation actions that could further reduce impacts are retrofits and infrastructure investments, low impact development, and increased inspection and maintenance of stormwater facilities. Adopted regulations may require

improvements to stormwater management or critical area restoration as new development occurs, which could positively impact water resources.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

The Poulsbo Municipal Code contains existing regulations for the avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of impacts to water resources, specifically stormwater, streams, wetlands, flood hazard areas, and critical aquifer recharge areas. These regulations are expected to minimize potential threats under all alternatives. Some impacts may still occur under all alternatives, including but not limited to decreases in forestland and vegetative cover, increases in impervious surfaces, erosion and sedimentation due to increased flow rates and volumes (resulting in the decline of nutrient balances, substrate quality, and habitat availability), decline of some wetland functions for hydrology, water quality, and habitat, and long-term cumulative reduction in groundwater recharge and associated discharge to streams. Significant and unavoidable adverse impacts under all alternatives are presumed to be low due to the extensive regulatory protections in place at the federal, state and local levels.

1.5.1.4 Fish, Wildlife, and Plants

How did we analyze Fish, Wildlife, and Plants?

Fish, Wildlife, and Plants Water impacts would primarily be associated with construction activity and thresholds for analysis included net loss of salmonid habitat needed to protect fish and treaty rights, loss of localized critical area functions and values, and contradicts best available science.

What impacts did we identify?

Population growth and associated urbanization impacts to fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas are likely under all alternatives. The extent of impacts to fish, wildlife, and plants will depend on the actual location and intensity of development, habitat size, and connectivity across the landscape. Impacts to streams, wetlands, groundwater, floodplains, and native vegetation detailed in the water resources section also apply to fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. This includes increased sedimentation and pollutants in runoff to streams and wetlands and decreases in native vegetation. Additionally, disruptions in seasonal hydrologic cycles, vegetation losses, reduced summer stream flows, increased stream temperatures, and reduced stream bank stability are all anticipated as a result of climate change. Stressors associated with climate change are projected to significantly impact fish and wildlife species, including Chinook, coho salmon, steelhead and bull trout, and amphibians.

Under all alternatives, a reduction in the type and coverage of vegetation within the city is expected due to future development activities. This is likely to decrease urban forest canopy. Indirect impacts may also occur with the introduction and establishment of nonnative invasive species that may outcompete and displace native species. Associated decreased tree health and resiliency, including increased presence of tree diseases like root rot and lower pest mortality from milder temperatures, are likely to impact forest tree canopy.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

Under any of the alternatives, the potential for adverse effects on fish, wildlife, and plants would be avoided, minimized, documented, and mitigated through regulatory reviews and permitting processes that apply to individual projects. None of the alternatives propose any modifications to those processes. Alternative 1 has the most potential to affect fish, wildlife, and plants due to the most dispersed growth near habitats.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Results in a net loss of salmonid habitat needed to protect fish and treaty rights | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Loss of localized critical area functions and values | ⊕ | ⊕ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Contradicts best available science | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ⊗ Moderate impact ⊕ High impact ⊕ ⊕ | | | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

Incorporated Comprehensive Plan policies within the Natural Environment Chapter include:

- Maintaining the City’s critical areas regulations and utilizing best available science as required by GMA and providing special consideration to anadromous fisheries

- Minimizing impacts on natural systems and riparian corridors
- Preserving and protecting natural surface water storage sites
- Preserving and protecting fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas
- Support Low Impact Development and Best Management techniques and strategies
- Coordinate planning and protection of critical areas and habitat with other local agencies and Tribes.
- Apply Shoreline Master Program policies and regulations
- Support continued to improve the City's tree canopy

Specific measures to mitigate impacts to Fish, Wildlife, and Plants from the alternatives proposed are included in the following regulations:

Local

- Tree Retention - PMC Chapter 18.180
- Landscaping – PMC Chapter 18.130
- Critical Areas Regulations - PMC Chapter 16.20
- Shoreline Master Program - PMC Chapter 16.08
- Project-level SEPA Review - PMC Chapter 16.04
- Floodplain Management - PMC Chapter 15.24

State

- Shoreline Management Act
- Washington State Hydraulic Code
- Clean Water Act Section 401

Federal

- Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
- Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Management and Conservation Act Consultation
- Clean Water Act Section 404
- Marine Mammal Protection Act
- Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

- Implement WRIA plans, such as directing development applicants to the mitigation opportunities.
- Use a watershed approach to design mitigation areas.
- Protect habitats of importance through acquisition and expansion of parklands, where appropriate.
- Adopt more protective detention standards that require new development to detain larger volumes of stormwater runoff on-site and in a manner that mimics predeveloped stormwater patterns.
- Adopt new development requirements that set maximum limits on the percentage of a new development that could be covered with impervious surfaces and that encourage the use of soil amendments to facilitate stormwater infiltration (i.e., low-impact development practices).
- Require construction activities near wetlands and streams to be scheduled during the dry season to reduce impacts to soils.
- Require development projects to address temperature impacts from stormwater runoff or stormwater ponds.
- Implement projects to correct existing erosion problems and reduce the potential for increased erosion in the future. Examples of potential projects include channel stabilization using techniques meeting Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife criteria for streambank stabilization or bypass pipelines to divert high flows around sections of erosive channels.
- Retrofit existing detention facilities to increase storage capacity and improve water quality treatment.
- Encourage buffer enhancement. Where protected stream and/or wetland buffers are in a degraded condition, encourage enhancement of the buffer through means such as establishment of native vegetation and control of non-native invasive plant species with a goal of providing high-quality riparian and stream habitat and discouraging human entry into the buffer area.
- Educate the public, especially owners of property along streams, about BMPs that could enhance or protect aquatic resources.

- Publicize and encourage the preservation of native soils and protection of the natural processes of soil maintenance and on-site hydrology. Leaving areas/tracts (belts) of native vegetation undisturbed in both commercial and residential developments can be shown to provide long-term benefits regarding stormwater management, on-site landscaping maintenance, microclimate, and general aesthetics/sense of well-being in a developed landscape.
- Sponsor or encourage public education about the benefits of native vegetation.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

The development and growth associated with every alternative would likely result in increased hard surfaces, increased vehicle use, and decreased vegetation, all of which can negatively impact fish, wildlife and plants. Development under all alternatives would require some losses of vegetative cover, which may result in changes in hydrologic conditions and habitat fragmentation. Distributing growth across more widespread, previously undeveloped areas will result in more impacts than focusing the same growth within centers. Compliance with applicable policies and regulations will provide mitigation for each alternative under the City’s stormwater management codes, critical areas codes, landscaping and shoreline master programs, as applicable. Therefore, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to fish, wildlife and plants are expected.

1.5.2 Built Environment

1.5.2.1 Land and Shoreline Use

How did we analyze Land and Shoreline Use?

The land and shoreline use evaluation is primarily associated with new residential and employment uses and associated structures; thresholds for analysis include consistency with PSRC Regional Growth Strategy in VISION 2050, land use capacity for growth targets, climate resilience and displacement risk.

What impacts did we identify?

All four alternatives assume increases in population, housing units and employment in Poulsbo over the course of the 20-year planning period. Under all alternatives, growth is anticipated to result in new development as well as redevelopment of some previously developed areas. The actual pace and distribution of future growth would be influenced in part by the implementation of Comprehensive Plan policies, related regulations, and actions, and by decisions made by individual property owners and developers. Areas experiencing new development or redevelopment would likely see an increase in local activity. General impacts associated with growth include the following:

- Conversion of undeveloped land for new residential, commercial, and/or industrial uses.
- Increased intensity of use, bulk and scale on developed parcels through redevelopment or infill development on underutilized parcels.
- Land use compatibility issues resulting from the encroachment of denser development patterns on current uses often less dense.
- Other impacts common to all Alternatives include displacement risk and sea level rise.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

All alternatives would result in new construction that will result in changes of use and the characteristics of parcels of land, with generalized increases in building height, bulk and scale, and development intensity over time. It also includes the gradual conversion of low-intensity uses to higher-intensity development patterns. While these impacts will be partially mitigated by the application of development regulations including design regulations, some changes in use and character are unavoidable aspects of growth.

As the City develops there may be displacement of existing housing and jobs, however, is not anticipated to be significant and adverse as PSRC’s displacement risk mapping tool indicates the city’s land use at a low risk for future displacement. Sea Level Rise impacts are potential under all alternatives, but continued regional coordination and required climate resilience planning by 2029 will assist the city in preparation.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Land Use Capacity for Growth Target | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Increased Intensity | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊕ | ⊕ |
| Displacement | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Climate Resilience | ⊕ | ⊕ | ⊕ | ⊕ |



What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

Incorporated Comprehensive Plan policies include:

- Support PSRC's regional growth strategy and VISION 2050
- Ensure sufficient land for the City's growth target
- Plan for active transportation needs and support transit access
- Identify and implement design elements for new development to complement and mitigate the bulk and scale of new buildings.
- Encourage walkability and social interaction
- Consider displacement of existing businesses and identify potential strategies
- Facilitate public and private beautification efforts
- Support adaptive reuse of buildings compatible with surrounding neighborhoods

Specific measures to mitigate impacts to Land and Shoreline Use from the alternatives proposed are included in the following:

- State and Regional Review: As required by GMA, the City of Poulsbo will notify the Department of Commerce (at least 60 days in advance) of intent to adopt under the Action Alternatives and provide a copy of the draft Comprehensive Plan amendments and development regulations for review and comment prior to final adoption. State law also requires PSRC to review and certify local comprehensive plans.
- Housing Action Plan: This Poulsbo Housing Action Plan (HAP) (2021) identifies strategies the City of Poulsbo can implement to support housing opportunities for residents at all income levels. These strategies are intended to increase housing production and choices available to better meet the diverse needs of Poulsbo residents and reduce displacement and barriers.
 - Identify strategic amendments to development standards, adopted in Ord. 2021-08, 2023-04, 2024-05, 2024-17, 2024-18,
 - Evaluate permit processes and identify opportunities to streamline and provide permit efficiencies, adopted in Ord. 2021-08, 2023-04, 2024-05 and 2024-18.
 - Increase funding for affordable housing through local option taxes, fees, and levies, adopted in Ord. 2019-15, 2021-07.
 - Unit Lot Subdivision standards, adopted with Ord. 2024-03
 - Revise ADU standards to allow flexibility, adopted with Ord. 2024-05
 - Commercial Flex Space, adopted with Ord. 2024-17
 - Allow more housing diversity in some single-family areas, Amendments adopted with Ordinance 2024-05.
 - Allow greater flexibility in multifamily zones, adopted with Ord. 2024-03.
 - Support and reduce barriers to the development of permanent supportive housing, adopted state requirements with Ord. 2024-05.
- PMC Title 18 Zoning regulates development standards — such as densities, minimum lot sizes, setbacks, height, landscaping, parking, and building design — and other measures regarding land use to reduce compatibility impacts.
- PMC Section 18.80.070 Infill and redevelopment incentives in C-2 (Viking Avenue) zoning district, including standards adopted with Ord. 2024-13.
- PMC Chapter 16.20, Critical Areas Ordinance.
- PMC Chapter 16.08 Shoreline Master Program.
- PMC Chapter 15.24 Floodplain Management.
- Prepare new Climate Change and Resiliency Element as required by HB 1181, to be included as a Comprehensive Plan amendment by 2029.

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

- Building and Site Design standards shall be reviewed and updated for commercial developments and Downtown Poulsbo.
- New building and site design standards shall be developed for new mixed use developments.
- New building and site design standards shall be considered for multi-family developments in the RM and RH zoning district.

- Require larger redevelopment areas and new development to provide squares, plazas, seating areas, and other public gathering spaces.
- New public civic buildings should include public gathering spaces, seating areas, and opportunities for public art.
- Utilized timed interior and exterior lighting for commercial, public and industrial uses.
- Sign regulations that help minimize the illumination, spill over and size of signs, including regulations that minimize the frequency of flashing electronic signs.
- Building design standards that address building mass and scale so as not to impede sunlight.
- Limit use of reflective materials and encourage use of low reflectance glass and other materials.
- Parking lot lighting standards that require low lumen lighting that is shielded and directed downwards and away from adjacent properties.
- Require screening and landscaping to minimize spill over from exterior lighting and vehicle headlights.
- Use of SEPA authority for aesthetics for impacts on site-specific development projects if needed for additional mitigation.
- Offer flexibility in building height, floor area, and other development standards for buildings that come into compliance with flood-resistant construction standards or that encourage retrofits that enhance resiliency.
- Create or identify resilience hubs for central point of resources. Identify one or more resilience hubs offering coordinated communication to community members, distribution of needed resources.
- Review and consider strategies identified in the Washington State Climate Resilience Strategy document.
- Continue to partner with US Navy, Kitsap County Department of Emergency Management and other appropriate agencies to prepare for the probability of some type of sea level rise.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Under all alternatives, additional growth would occur across the city and a generalized increase in building height and bulk and development intensity over time, as well as the gradual conversion of low-intensity uses to higher-intensity development patterns. This transition would be unavoidable, but it is not significant and adverse since this is an expected characteristic of the City's obligation under the Growth Management Act and helps fulfill Countywide Planning Policies and VISION 2050 strategies for focusing growth in high- capacity transit areas.

Future growth is likely to create localized land use compatibility issues as development occurs. The potential impacts related to these changes may differ in intensity and location in each of the alternatives. However, with the combination of existing and new development regulations, zoning requirements, and design guidelines, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts are anticipated.

1.5.2.2 Plans and Policies

How did we analyze Plans and Policies?

Plans and policies impacts would primarily be associated ensuring consistency with state, regional and local planning policies; thresholds for analysis included consistency with GMA Goals and Periodic Review, consistency with VISION 2050, and consistency with Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies.

What impacts did we identify?

Growth Management Act – Goals: All alternatives are generally consistent with the intent of the GMA planning goals. While all alternatives have policies to support affordable and diverse housing, Alternatives 1 and 2 do not have the capacity to meet the housing targets by income band.

VISION 2050 - Goals: While all alternatives generally address the VISION 2050 goals, Alternatives 2, 3 and 4 include plan updates that better meet these goals as a compact urban city with multimodal transportation network.

Countywide Planning Policies - Growth Targets: Kitsap County CPPs set growth targets for 5,646 new residents, 4,000 new jobs, and 1,977 new housing units in Poulsbo by 2044. In addition, the CPPs establish housing unit targets by income band. Alternatives 1 and 2 do not have sufficient capacity to meet the housing targets by income band, Alternatives 3 and 4 do.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

All alternatives are consistent with the intent of the GMA, Vision 2050, and Kitsap County CPPs. However, Alternative 1 and 2 do not provide sufficient capacity to meet the housing targets by income band.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Consistent GMA Goals and Periodic Review | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Consistent with VISION 2050 | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Consistent with Countywide Planning Policies | ✚ ✚ | ✚ ✚ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ✘ Moderate impact ✚ High impact ✚ ✚ | | | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

Incorporated Comprehensive Plan policies include:

- Support PSRC’s regional growth strategy and VISION 2050
- Ensure sufficient land for City’s growth target
- Plan for active transportation needs and support transit access
- Identify and implement design elements for new development to complement and mitigate the bulk and scale of new buildings.
- Encourage walkability and social interaction
- Consider displacement of existing businesses and identify potential strategies
- Facilitate public and private beautification efforts
- Support adaptive reuse of buildings compatible with surrounding neighborhoods

Applicable Regulations or Commitments include:

- State and Regional Review: As required by GMA, the City of Poulsbo will notify the Department of Commerce (at least 60 days in advance) of intent to adopt under the Action Alternatives and provide a copy of the draft Comprehensive Plan amendments and development regulations for review and comment prior to final adoption. State law also requires PSRC to review and certify local comprehensive plans.
- Housing Action Plan: This Poulsbo Housing Action Plan (HAP) (2021) identifies strategies the City of Poulsbo can implement to support housing opportunities for residents at all income levels. These strategies are intended to increase housing production and choices available to better meet the diverse needs of Poulsbo residents and reduce displacement and barriers.
 - Identify strategic amendments to development standards, adopted in Ord. 2021-08, 2023-04, 2024-05, 2024-17, 2024-18,
 - Evaluate permit processes and identify opportunities to streamline and provide permit efficiencies, adopted in Ord. 2021-08, 2023-04, 2024-05 and 2024-18.
 - Increase funding for affordable housing through local option taxes, fees, and levies, adopted in Ord. 2019-15, 2021-07.
 - Unit Lot Subdivision standards, adopted with Ord. 2024-03
 - Revise ADU standards to allow flexibility, adopted with Ord. 2024-05
 - Commercial Flex Space, adopted with Ord. 2024-17
 - Allow more housing diversity in some single-family areas, Amendments adopted with Ordinance 2024-05.
 - Allow greater flexibility in multifamily zones, adopted with Ord. 2024-03.
 - Support and reduce barriers to the development of permanent supportive housing, adopted state requirements with Ord. 2024-05.
- PMC Title 18 Zoning regulates development standards — such as densities, minimum lot sizes, setbacks, height, landscaping, parking, and building design — and other measures regarding land use to reduce compatibility impacts.
- PMC Section 18.80.070 Infill and redevelopment incentives in C-2 (Viking Avenue) zoning district, including standards adopted with Ord. 2024-13.

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

- Provide density bonuses for projects that set aside income-restricted units.
- Review street standards to identify barriers.
- Evaluate the MFTE program to incentivize the construction of housing units.
- Flexible use on first floors in Commercial zones.
- Explore “micro-housing” style developments.



With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Significant and unavoidable adverse impacts are expected under Alternatives 1 and 2, related to plans and policies, as the housing targets by income band would not be met. Such inconsistencies with state requirements, regional plans, and countywide planning policies would be avoided through policies and actions proposed under Alternatives 3 and 4.

1.5.2.3 Population, Housing & Employment

How did we analyze Population, Housing, and Employment?

Population, housing and employment impacts thresholds of analysis are: meeting the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policy (CPP) population growth target, meeting the CPP housing growth target (including by income band), meeting the CPP employment growth target, providing a mix of housing types.

What impacts did we identify?

As the city grows over the next 20 years, there is a need to ensure sufficient buildable land, expand variety and availability of housing, as well as the services and amenities necessary to support a larger population. Under expected growth, displacement of both residents and businesses could potentially occur in different ways:

- Without sufficient capacity to accommodate growth, residential and commercial rents will increase, displacing lower-income households that cannot afford increased housing costs as well as businesses that may also rely on lower rents.
- Residential displacement may also be present with significant redevelopment, as more obsolete housing units that may be more affordable are demolished in favor of new housing that is more expensive because it is newer.

Other impacts may occur related to changes in local population, housing, and employment:

- Access to services. While accommodating expected population increases in the city, access to services is also important in managing future growth. Even with the prevalence of online services, residents and workers in the city need retail, restaurant, and service offerings to meet their needs.
- Improvements in walkability and transit access. Providing a growth strategy focused on an existing transit corridor (SR 305) can help to reduce VMTs and resulting emissions from single-occupancy vehicles. Similarly, they can provide alternatives for access for those that have restrictions on their ability to drive.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

Under the estimates of capacity, Alternatives 1 and 2 would be challenged in meeting housing targets per income band. Conversely, Alternatives 3 and 4 would be able to meet expected housing targets under the Kitsap County CPPs. Alternative 4 provides the highest mix of housing types.

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

Under the alternatives, there are several possible approaches to address impacts:

- *Expansion of housing options.* Revisions to zoning and development regulations, especially under Alternatives 2, 3, and 4, can help to encourage different housing formats that can address affordable housing needs for households at different income levels.
- *Additional support through housing subsidies, incentives, and partnerships.* Beyond providing for a wider range of housing formats, the city has additional options to support housing subsidies, incentives, and other sources of funding to increase the supply of income-restricted, rent-restricted housing. This can include options that can meet the needs of moderate-, low-, very low-, and extremely low-income households, as well as residents requiring permanent supportive housing, emergency housing options, and other special housing types. These options may include coordination with outside agencies, as well as programs such as the Multifamily Housing Property Tax Exemption (MFTE).

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Meets CPP Population Growth Target | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Meets CPP Job Growth Target | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Meets CPP Housing Target w/Income Bands | ⊕ ⊕ | ⊕ ⊕ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Provides mix of housing types | ⊕ | ⊕ | ⊗ | ⊗ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ⊗ | Moderate impact ⊕ | High impact ⊕ ⊕ | | |

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Under all alternatives, additional population, job and housing growth will occur. Housing affordability would continue to be a challenge in Poulsbo under all alternatives due to the pressures of regional population and employment growth. However, changes considered in Alternatives 2, 3, and 4 are expected to increase housing supply and diversity, reducing competition for available units and therefore reducing upward pressure on market housing costs. Mitigation measures have potential to increase the supply of units affordable to low-income households, but significant investment from state and/or federal sources would be required to meet all low-income, supportive, and emergency housing needs.

1.5.2.4 Transportation

How did we analyze Transportation?

Transportation impacts would primarily be associated with population, housing and job growth, and thresholds for analysis included need for active transportation facilities, need for transit system improvement, and intersection level of service standards impact.

What impacts did we identify?

2044 Intersection Level of Service: The City’s desired level of service standard for local streets is LOS D, while the minimum acceptable standard is LOS E. Delays are forecasted to increase at some intersections over existing conditions, all City owned intersections are forecasted to perform at or better than the adopted LOS standard in the year 2044. The forecasted 2044 LOS along SR 305 in Poulsbo does not meet WSDOT’s current LOS standard of D at five locations, however some of the intersections do meet the City’s concurrency standards of LOS E for Major Arterials.

Active Transportation: All alternatives will increase the need for active transportation facilities citywide. The 2024 Transportation Comprehensive Plan’s Active Transportation section identifies existing sidewalks, shared use paths and bicycle facilities, gaps and prioritized connections and improvements. Alternatives 3 and 4 will increase the demand for these facilities due to its center-approach to growth promoting active transportation facilities within ¼ mile walkshed to transit facilities.

Transit Ridership: Demand for transit is expected to increase under all alternatives and is expected to increase more under Alternatives 3 and 4, which include the SR 305 Corridor Center, which supports transit-oriented development, improved active transportation facilities, and improved access to transit. The City of Poulsbo does not currently have any funding committed for future improvements to transit facilities. However, the City is committed to being an active partner with Kitsap Transit and Jefferson Transit to increase options for access to and the use of transit in Poulsbo.

As part of its 2024 Transportation Comprehensive Plan and 2024 Complete Streets Plan, the City focused on improving multimodal connections to transit and prioritizing projects that remove barriers to people walking, rolling, cycling, or using transit. Close coordination with Kitsap Transit and other transit providers will be necessary to ensure that Complete Streets improvements support transit service and enhance access to transit for people living in, working in, and visiting Poulsbo.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

Intersection delays beyond the adopted level of service standards will primarily occur in intersections with SR 305, with the most delay under Alternative 4. Active transportation and transit needs will increase under Alternatives 3 and 4 with due to its Centers-focused approach to growth. Improving connections for pedestrians and bicyclists to identified destinations as well as facilities that improve level of stress, will be necessary to support the expected housing units and jobs

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Intersection Level of Service standards impact | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊕ | ⊕ |
| Active Transportation Facilities | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊕ | ⊕ |
| Transit System Ridership Improvement | ⊗ | ⊗ | ⊕ | ⊕ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ⊗ Moderate impact ⊕ High impact ⊕ ⊕ | | | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

- Support and participate in regional transportation planning processes
- Ensure a multimodal transportation system that supports PSRC’s Regional Growth Strategy
- Establish multimodal level of service standards
- Maintain and improve connectivity to and between Centers and neighborhoods.

- Ensure LOS on city streets and concurrency requirements are maintained when new development occurs.

Applicable Regulations or Commitments include:

- City of Poulsbo Transportation Comprehensive Plan, 2024
- [City's annual Transportation Improvement Program \(TIP\)](#)
- City's 6-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)
- Continue to require developer funded street improvements and new roadway construction consistent with PMC [17.80.050](#) and [17.80.060](#) and Poulsbo Street Construction Standards
- [City of Poulsbo Construction Standards, Section 2 Streets](#)
- [ADA Transition Plan](#)
- [Poulsbo Street and Pedestrian Safety Plan](#)
- Traffic Impact Fees
- Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) required with project development review
- Transportation Demand Management strategies
- Pavement Management Program
- Continue City participation in the regional transportation planning process through Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council and Puget Sound Regional Council.
- Maintain the City's concurrency management system to ensure that adequate transportation facilities are available to serve new development.
- Continue to utilize the travel demand forecasting model developed as part of the 2024 Transportation Comprehensive Plan to anticipate future growth so transportation facilities can be programmed prioritized in the City's 6-year Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

Other Potential Mitigation Measures include:

- Partner with Kitsap Transit to provide multi-modal and public transportation opportunities throughout city and UGA.
- Collaborate with WSDOT to plan for and address anticipated LOS at SR 305 intersections.
- Seek available transportation grant funding, collect impact fees, and identify new funding sources to support identified necessary transportation system improvements.
- Continue implementing the recommendations from the Poulsbo Traffic Demand Management Study.
- Relax transportation level of service standards.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

The implementation of all alternatives will result in increased vehicle traffic within the city. The severity of most impacts will likely be mitigated through a combination of policy, programmatic, developer improvements and city-initiated improvements through capital facilities planning as identified and prioritized in the 2024 Transportation Comprehensive Plan, the City's Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and transportation impact fees.

1.5.2.5 Cultural and Historic Resources

How did we analyze Cultural and Historic Resources?

Impacts of the alternatives on cultural and historic resources are considered significant if they would result in the loss of culturally significant sites, artifacts, or art.

What impacts did we identify?

Impacts to cultural resources under all alternatives would include projects or specific construction activities that may disturb or destroy undocumented historical or cultural resources during construction activities. Future development projects would continue to be required to comply with federal, state, and local regulations to protect cultural and historic resources.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

Alternatives 3 and 4 accommodates more residential and employment growth than Alternative 1 and 2. Alternatives 3 and 4 would focus additional residential and job growth within the SR 305 Corridor Center. Archaeological sites are likely to be located within the vicinity of shorelines and water bodies, therefore development near or adjacent to shorelines has the potential to impacts on undocumented historical or cultural resources. Alternatives 3 and 4 do include a portion of the South Fork of Dogfish Creek within its boundaries.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Loss of culturally significant sites, artifacts | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ | ✘ |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact ✘ | Moderate impact + | High impact + + | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

Incorporated comprehensive plan policies include:

- Preservation of regional historic, visual and cultural resources, landmarks, sites, tribal treaty fishing, hunting and gathering grounds.
- Consider appropriate levels of participation in historic preservation.

Applicable Regulations or Commitments include:

- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966.
- Archeological Resources Protection Act of 1979.
- Washington State has a number of laws that oversee the protection and proper excavation of archaeological sites (RCW 27.53, WAC 25-48), human remains (RCW 27.44), and historic cemeteries or graves (RCW 68.60). Under RCW 27.53, Department Archaeology and Historic Preservation regulates the treatment of archaeological sites on both public and private lands and has the authority to require specific treatment of archaeological resources. All precontact resources or sites are protected, regardless of their significance or eligibility for local, state, or national registers. Historic archaeological resources or sites are protected unless DAHP has made a determination of “not-eligible” for listing on the WHR and the NRHP.
 - If human remains, burials, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony are found during project implementation, all provisions of RCW 68.50.645 apply including notification of appropriate authorities.
 - If prehistoric artifacts or historic-period artifacts or features are found during project implementation, all work must cease within 200 feet of the find, Washington State Department Archaeology and Historic Preservation must be contacted and all provisions of RCW 27.53.060 shall be adhered to.
- State Environmental Policy Act and National Environmental Policy Act.
- Archaeology and Historic Preservation, RCW 27.34.22, and WAC 25-12.
- Governor’s Executive Order 21-02, Archaeological and Cultural Resources.
- Poulsbo’s Shoreline Master Program

Other Potential Mitigation Measures

- Cooperate with the Poulsbo Historical Society, Suquamish Tribe, other organizations and interested citizens in identifying historical, archaeological and cultural resources that provide unique insights into the history and the development of the city.
- Preserve and/or acquire historical or cultural resources as feasible.
- Consider funding a financial assistance program where the City offers grants or low-interest loans to city property owners to repair or rehabilitate aging or substandard housing, in order to preserve these older homes and prevent demolition and redevelopment.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Future growth and development within Poulsbo could disturb or destroy previously undiscovered and undocumented archaeological or historical artifacts. With proposed mitigation measures, these impacts are not considered significant unavoidable adverse impacts.

1.5.2.6 Public Services

How did we analyze Public Services?

Public Services impacts would primarily be associated with population, housing and job growth, and thresholds for analysis included: access to parks and open space; impact on police level of demand; impact on fire and emergency services response time; and impact on schools’ level of demand.

What impacts did we identify?

Under all alternatives, increased population and employment growth in the city could generate additional demand for emergency services, parks, and schools.



- *Police.* All alternatives could increase the demand for police service. Employment and retail centers as well as major transportation corridors would likely continue to have higher calls for service under all alternatives. All alternatives increase jobs and would likely see calls for service increase. Retail areas may see more theft and other employment types may see other types of crime.
- *Parks.* Growth and development Poulso under all alternatives would likely result in increased demand for additional access to park and recreation facilities. Based on the City’s adopted LOS standards in the 2021 PROS Plan, there would be a deficit of City-owned Park property under all alternatives.
- *Fire/EMS.* Growth and development in Poulso would create more demand for fire and emergency medical services and place additional pressure on the Poulso Fire Department (PFD) to meet response time standards under all alternatives. Emergency medical services typically generate the highest demand for PFD. The number and type of service calls under each alternative would depend on many demographic factors such as age of new residents, prevalence of multifamily dwellings with new fire-suppressions systems, and the ongoing efforts for fire prevention education and outreach conducted by PFD. Over time, additional staffing, equipment, or facilities may be required to maintain or improve performance levels.
- *Schools.* The population growth that will occur under all alternatives is projected to minimally increase demand of school services. NKSD student projections based upon recent information and projections in population, housing and births, including projected growth. Projected student enrollment is not expected to exceed the current capacity of NKSD schools.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

All Alternatives plan for more population, housing, and jobs to meet regional plans and policies to focus growth. This will drive a demand for more emergency services and parks.

- *Police.* Police services demand will increase under all alternatives. Alternatives 3 and 4 will likely increase demand due to increased capacity for more population and housing unit growth.
- *Parks.* Demand for city parks would increase with each of the alternatives as level of service is based upon acreage of parkland by 1,000 population. Alternatives 3 and 4 could result in need for additional parks with concentration of additional growth within the SR 305 Corridor Center.
- *Fire/EMS.* Demand for fire and emergency services would increase with each of the alternatives, although response time will vary depending on location. Alternatives 3 and 4 focus increased capacity within the SR 305 Corridor Center, which is generally under a six-minute response time from Poulso Fire Department’s Station 71. Alternatives 1 and 2 dispersed growth citywide may result in longer response times, although the planned Viking Way NW new station is intended to ensure appropriate response times for western Poulso.
- *Schools.* Demand for schools would increase with each of the alternatives, although it may vary depending on the types of housing units. Alternatives 1 and 2 may result in greater demand as single-family housing has higher household size (usually due to school-aged children) than Alternative 3 and 4’s multifamily housing which has a lower household size. However, enrollment projections are to be within the current capacity of NKHS schools.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Parks – Access to parks and open space | + | + | + | + |
| Police – Level of demand | + | + | + | + |
| Fire and Emergency Medical Services – LOS standards met (response time) | + | + | + | + |
| Schools – Level of demand | × | × | × | × |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact × Moderate impact + High impact ++ | | | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

- *Police.* Regular police capital facility planning by City through comprehensive plan’s capital facilities section updates and City’s biennium budget process ensuring equipment needs could be taken as growth occurs to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.



- *Parks*. Implementation of parks capital facilities plan including acquisition of land and park development, update to impact fees for new development, bonds, grants, and other funding sources could be taken as growth occurs to reduce impacts to a less than significant level.
- *Fire/EMS*. Regular fire and emergency services capital facility planning by Poulsbo Fire District, enactment of impact fees for new development, levies and other steps could be taken as growth occurs to reduce impacts to less than significant level. Implementation of Poulsbo Fire's 2024 Capital Facilities Plan.
- *Schools*. Regular school capital facility planning by North Kitsap School District, adjustments to attendance areas, bonds, levies, and other steps could be taken as growth occurs to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Implementation of North Kitsap School District's 2024 Facilities and Technology Capital Levy.

Other mitigating measures could be implemented to mitigate the impacts of all three alternatives:

- Seek, authorize, collect and implement all funding sources available to it for the funding and implementation of its Capital Facility Plan. The City shall utilize a variety of revenue sources, including utility rates, connection charges, revenue bonds, grants, loans, impact fees, mitigation fees, voluntary contributions, provision of public facilities, and any other legally accepted sources.
- Enact impact fee ordinances under the authority and constraints of the Growth Management Act.
- Review Parks Level of Service at each functional plan six-year update in order to adapt to changing demands.
- Continue to utilize grants, donations and other funding sources to acquire land for public parks and open space.
- Collaborate with private and public organizations to identify, acquire, preserve, operate and maintain public park and open spaces.
- Encourage continued coordination between Poulsbo Fire Department and other neighboring fire districts.
- Support any future Poulsbo Fire Department's voted bonds to support adequate fire protection for the city and UGA.
- Support additional law enforcement personnel and equipment when increase in population warrants such an increase.
- The North Kitsap School district should continue to monitor demographic changes and proactively plan meet the future needs of its student population.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

Future population and employment growth will increase the demand for public services including parks, police, fire/EMT, and schools. This growth would occur incrementally over the planning period and would be addressed during regular capital planning efforts. Each service provider could evaluate levels of service and funding sources to balance with expected growth. With implementation of mitigation measures and regular periodic review of plans, no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to public services are anticipated.

1.5.2.7 Utilities

How did we analyze Utilities?

Utilities impacts would primarily be associated with population, housing and job growth, and thresholds for analysis include increased demand for: water, sewer, stormwater, energy and telecommunications, and solid waste.

What impacts did we identify?

The GMA requires that utility planning and infrastructure be planned, to be provided or in place before development can be approved.

- *Water*: All alternatives fit within the water system full buildout analysis and any increases to water demand are expected to be covered by the City's existing water rights and system, agreement with Kitsap Public Utilities District and identified capital improvement projects. All developments may require developer-financed improvements to the water system serving that development. These improvements will be constructed concurrently with the development. Some projects to serve the additional growth may benefit a larger area and several future projects. The projects that benefit a larger area may need to be constructed with latecomers or other reimbursement agreements for future development.
- *Sewer*: All alternatives fit within the sewer system full buildout analysis and any increases to sewer demand are expected to be covered by the City's sewer system, identified capital improvement projects and wastewater treatment. All developments may require developer-financed improvements to the sewer system serving that development. These improvements will be constructed concurrently with the development. Some projects to serve the additional growth may benefit a larger area and several future projects. The projects that benefit a larger area may need to be constructed with latecomers or other reimbursement agreements for future development.

- **Stormwater:** The Impervious surface will be increased in all alternatives. Stormwater regulations (Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington and City’s Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit) would provide levels of flow control and water quality treatment. Although water quality facilities are designed to remove certain pollutants from stormwater, they may not remove all pollutants. All developments may require developer financed improvements to the storm system serving that development. These improvements will be constructed concurrently with the development. Some projects to serve the additional growth may benefit a larger area and several future projects. The projects that benefit a larger area may need to be constructed with latecomers or other reimbursement agreements for future development.
- **Telecommunications:** Telecommunications services are mostly provided by regional providers that conduct their own planning processes to ensure that adequate system capacity is available to support future demand, and that infrastructure is updated as necessary to serve growth.
- **Solid Waste:** Under all alternatives, future population growth would increase waste generation and the need for solid waste collection and processing. The amount of waste disposing of is also influenced by employment levels, other economic factors, and recycling rates.

What is the difference between the alternatives?

All alternatives will increase demand for water, sewer, telecommunications and solid waste. The difference between Alternatives 1 and 2 and Alternatives 3 and 4 lies in their growth distribution strategy. Alternatives 1 and 2 disburses housing growth across the city, whereas Alternatives 3 and 4 concentrates portion of growth to SR 305 Corridor Center and accommodates it vertically through mid-rise buildings.

- **Water:** Demand for drinking water would increase with each of the alternatives. All capital improvement projects identified in the water functional plan are necessary for all four alternatives. The City’s 2024 Water System Plan analyzes Alternative 4 and provides a comparison to Alternative 1. Since Alternative 4 provides the highest growth potential it was used for all projections and analysis in the Water System Plan Update to be conservative.
- **Sewer:** All alternatives fit within the sewer system 2041/2044 peak flow projects and increases to sewer demand are expected to be covered by the identified capital improvement projects and wastewater treatment. The 2024 General Sewer Plan includes a hydraulic modeling analysis to compare the 2027, 2041/2044 Alternative 4 projected peak flow demand by existing system capacity. A number of deficiencies in gravity sewer capacity and lift station capacity were identified and are addressed by improvements included in the sewer capital facilities improvements projects.
- **Stormwater:** With the regulatory framework and greater emphasis in recent years on surface water management, the alternatives do not demonstrate a high likelihood of significantly increasing flooding or erosion overall, although there are likely to be some localized impacts. There is not one alternative that would have greater impact as stormwater regulations would provide flow control and water quality treatment for new developments. Alternative 4 would likely decrease the impervious surface per capita by increasing the density of middle and high-density residential zones, promoting growth where transportation infrastructure already exists, and emphasizing middle housing. By reducing the impervious surface per capita, growth Alternative 4 may require less stormwater mitigation when compared to the other growth alternatives
- **Telecommunications:** Telecommunications services are mostly provided by regional providers that conduct their own planning processes to ensure that adequate system capacity is available to support future demand, and that infrastructure is updated as necessary to serve growth.
- **Solid Waste:** Solid waste impacts are generally the same across all alternatives as increased garbage and recycling services will be necessary for housing and job growth. As there is additional capacity for Alternatives 3 and 4, demand for increased trash and recycling services may result under these alternatives.

| Threshold | Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 | Alternative 4 |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| Water | + | + | + | + |
| Sewer | + | + | + | + |
| Stormwater | x | x | x | x |
| Energy & Telecommunications | x | x | x | x |
| Solid Waste | x | x | x | x |
| Potential for Adverse Impacts: No or Low impact x Moderate impact + High impact ++ | | | | |

What are some solutions or mitigations for impacts?

The City regularly plans for and adapts to changing growth patterns to ensure adequate and reliable utility services long term. Existing policies, regulations, and commitments to mitigate potential adverse impacts to water, wastewater, and stormwater would continue to apply under all alternatives. The GMA requires UGAs to be already served or readily served by public facilities and services, and if public facilities and services cannot be maintained at an acceptable LOS, the new development should be prohibited (RCW 36.70A.100). The regulatory framework is designed to avoid the situation where utilities become overextended and are not available to be planned to meet the demands of growth. It is one of the significant underpinnings of the Growth Management Act.

In addition, the utilities' functional plans for water, sewer and stormwater management were updated concurrently with comprehensive plan periodic update and have utilized the population and jobs growth projections in demand modeling. Capital improvement projects have been identified for the 20-year planning period and included in the comprehensive plan's capital facilities section.

Incorporated comprehensive plan policies include:

- Level of service standards for City utilities
- Continue utility system plan updates to ensure City is continuously planning for growth
- Ensure long-term capacity for City utilities
- Implementation of identified capital improvement projects

Applicable Regulations or Commitments include:

- Washington State Department of Health Office of Drinking Water
- Washington State Department of Ecology- Water Quality/Wastewater
- Washington State Department of Ecology - Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington
- EPA Pollution Discharge Elimination System permit program
- Poulsbo Municipal Code Title 13 – Public Services
- City Engineering Design and Construction Standards

Other Mitigation Measures include:

- Continue to update its water, sewer, and stormwater system plans at a minimum of every six years to ensure it is meeting the short-term and long-term capacity needs of the city, as well as applicable state agency requirements.
- Review construction standards regularly to ensure the City's standards are current and relevant to the changing needs of the city.
- Develop and implement proactive water conservation and education programs.
- Continue inflow and infiltration evaluations of the City's sewer system.
- Continue to coordinate with Kitsap County Public Works to ensure there is adequate capacity at the Central Kitsap Wastewater Treatment Plan.
- Incorporate LID standards and techniques for storm water management should be incorporated wherever possible to aid in the reduction of storm water impacts.
- Regional detention and water quality facilities should be used wherever feasible to provide economies in space.
- To the extent that is financially possible, existing storm water systems should be retrofitted with Best Management Practices (BMPs) that reduce pollutant loading.

With mitigation, what is the ultimate outcome?

There would be no significant unavoidable adverse impacts to utilities under any of the alternatives. Services generally have capacity to serve, and where there are deficiencies in current infrastructure, there are plans and regulations to ensure that there is proper connection and sizing. Targeted investments identified in functional plans, capital facilities plan and implemented through the City's capital facilities budget process will ensure adequate capacity under all alternatives.