

2004 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT DOCKET

Department of Community Development Staff Report and SEPA Addendum

JEFFERSON COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Preliminary Staff Recommendation
with Environmental Analysis
for the Adoption of Amendments
to the 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan

September 22, 2004

***INTEGRATED GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT/
STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT DOCUMENT***

Environmental Review of a Non-Project Action:
Addendum to Existing Environmental Documents

Table of Contents

	Page
<u>1 Environmental Summary and Fact Sheet</u>	<u>1-2</u>
1.1 Fact Sheet	1-2
1.2 Environmental Summary	1-2
1.2.1 Introduction and Process	1-2
1.2.1.1 Adoption of Existing Environmental Documents	1-2
1.2.1.2 Incorporation of Documents by Reference	1-2
1.2.1.3 Level of Environmental Analysis	1-2
1.2.1.4 Process and Public Involvement	1-2
1.2.2 Major Conclusions	1-2
1.2.2.1 Summary Matrix of Impacts and Mitigation Measures	1-2
1.2.2.2 Comparison of Current and Proposed Land Use District Designations	1-2
1.2.2.3 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	1-2
1.2.3 Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty	1-2
1.2.4 Issues to Be Resolved	1-2
1.2.4.1 Environmental Choices to Be Made	1-2
1.2.4.2 Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures	1-2
1.2.4.3 Main Options to Be Preserved or Foreclosed by the Action	1-2
<u>2 Concise Analysis of the Proposals</u>	<u>2-2</u>
2.1 Overview	2-2
2.1.1 Staff Reports, Cumulative Analysis, and Staff Recommendations	2-2
2.1.2 Growth Management Indicators	2-2
2.2 Final Docket	2-2
2.2.1 Staff Recommendation Summary	2-2
2.3 Staff Reports: Suggested Amendments	2-2
2.3.1 Proposals Involving the Jefferson County International Airport	2-2
2.3.1.1 Reference Number: MLA03-232 (Port of Port Townsend – Airport)	2-2
2.3.1.2 Reference Number: MLA03-244 (People for a Rural Quimper – Airport)	2-2
2.3.2 Proposals Initiated by Jefferson County	2-2
2.3.2.1 Reference Number: MLA04-27 (Jefferson County – Agricultural Lands)	2-2
2.3.2.2 Reference Number: MLA04-28 (Jefferson County – Comprehensive Plan Update/Assessment)	2-2
<u>3 Supporting Record, Analyses, and Materials</u>	<u>3-2</u>
<u>4 Distribution List</u>	<u>4-2</u>

5	<u>Appendices</u>	<u>5-2</u>
5.1	Item 1: Legal Notice (September 22, 2004)	5-2
5.2	Item 2: Resolution 55-03 re: population projection and allocation	5-2
5.3	Item 3: Proposed Airport Overlay District: 55-DNL noise contour map	5-2
5.4	Item 4: MLA03-232 Staff Recommendation	5-2
5.5	Item 5: MLA03-232 Table 3-1	5-2
5.6	Item 6: Port of Port Townsend letter	5-2
5.7	Item 7: List of Agricultural Lands Designation Requests	5-2
5.8	Item 8: List of Recommended Denials and Anomalies re: Agricultural Lands requests	5-2
5.9	Item 9: map of East Jefferson County Agricultural Lands including re-designation requests	5-2
5.10	Item 10: map of West Jefferson County Agricultural Lands including re-designation requests	5-2
5.11	Item 11: Public Works Memorandum re: Agricultural Lands and transportation	5-2
5.12	Item 12: 010 Transportation Element	5-2
5.13	Item 13: 010 Transportation Element line-in/line-out version	5-2
5.14	Item 14: Table 10-6 Existing & Forecast Ave. Daily Trips (ADT) & Levels of Service (LOS)	5-2
5.15	Item 15: Utilities Element	5-2
5.16	Item 16: Capital Facilities Element	5-2
5.17	Item 17: Review of Best Available Science	5-2
5.18	Item 18: Proposed UDC Amendments per Review of Best Available Science	5-2
5.19	Item 19: Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Assessment and Amendment Criteria	5-2
5.20	Item 20: 01 Introduction - Implementation and Monitoring	5-2
5.21	Item 21: 03 Land Use and Rural	5-2
5.22	Item 22: 05 Housing	5-2
5.23	Item 23: 06 Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation	5-2
5.24	Item 24: 07 Economic Development	5-2
5.25	Item 25: 08 Environment	5-2
5.26	Item 26: SR 19 & 20 General Crossroads map with adjacent parcel 001-282-007	5-2
5.27	Item 27: Comprehensive Plan Update EIS Addendum	5-2

1 Environmental Summary and Fact Sheet

1.1 FACT SHEET

Title and Description of Proposed Action

Pursuant to the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) is considering adoption of four (4) individual amendment proposals to the 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. The four suggested amendments compose the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket, which is the “Final Docket” for this year’s annual amendment cycle.¹ Two of the Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals are accompanied by associated Unified Development Code (UDC) amendments.

This document is a combined Staff Report and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Addendum for the four suggested amendments. The objective is to analyze the proposed amendments individually and cumulatively with regard to Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria outlined in UDC Section 9 and potential environmental impacts as proscribed in SEPA. Adoption of Comprehensive Plan amendments is a non-project action under SEPA and is not intended to satisfy individual project action SEPA requirements (i.e., the review needed for a future land use or building permit application).

Following are brief descriptions of each of the four suggested amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Each case has a Master Land Use Application (MLA) file number for reference:

1. **MLA03-232** proposed by the Port of Port Townsend suggesting the following: (1) Proposes an Essential Public Facilities (EPF) district designation rather than an overlay for the Jefferson County Airport (JCIA); (2) proposes the establishment of an Airport Overlay based on a 55-DNL noise contour map projected through the year 2022 and adopted in 2004 with the Airport Master Plan (AMP); (3) proposes Comprehensive Plan and UDC changes related to the allowed and prohibited land uses within the Airport EPF and the Airport Overlay; (4) proposes a disclosure process by which prospective property owners and current owners who apply for certain land use approvals in the Airport Overlay would be informed about the close proximity

¹ The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket was established earlier this year by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) with five (5) items. One of those items, under file number MLA04-29, involved urban growth area (UGA) planning in the Irondale and Port Hadlock area of unincorporated Jefferson County. The BOCC enacted Comprehensive Plan amendments related to the UGA in August, apart from the other items on the 2004 Docket, as part of a growth management compliance schedule. Four items remain on the 2004 Docket for consideration this autumn.

to the JCIA and that the County does not consider noise impacts related to normal airport operations to be a public nuisance; and (5) proposes a future planning process in which industrial uses would be considered in or adjacent to the Airport EPF in order to promote Airport self-sustainability.

2. **MLA03-244** proposed by a citizen group, People for a Rural Quimper (PRQ), suggesting the following: Proposed Comprehensive Plan policy changes related to the elimination of requirements for Jefferson County to adopt an Airport Overlay or Noise Overlay ordinance and to support implementation of Airport Master Plan policies regarding land use at the Jefferson County International Airport.
3. **MLA04-27** proposed by Jefferson County suggesting the following: Proposal to consider a set of 253 parcels of land for designation as Agricultural Lands on the map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations. The full parcel list is included and analyzed in the available Staff Report. This process is the final step in an Agricultural Lands planning effort initiated early last year and intended to complete tasks identified in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.
4. **MLA04-28** proposed by Jefferson County suggesting the following: Part A of this proposal consists of Comprehensive Plan and UDC amendments developed by staff as part of the statutory 2004 growth management update requirements in the Growth Management Act (GMA), Chapter 36.70A. The principal areas for consideration are population allocation, capital facilities and transportation planning, and best available science as applied to the regulatory protection of environmentally critical areas. Part B involves a Planning Commission five-year assessment of the Comprehensive Plan and corresponding amendment proposal pursuant to UDC Section 9.5.4. The Planning Commission proposal is intended to replace or eliminate outdated, redundant, and regulatory language and includes amendments to the following Comprehensive Plan chapters: Introduction; Plan Implementation and Monitoring; Land Use and Rural; Housing; Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation; Economic Development; and Environment. The Planning Commission proposal also includes one site-specific land use re-designation involving 18 acres currently zoned Rural Residential 1:10 and occupied by the Wheel-In Motor Movie drive-in theater. Parcel number 001-282-007 located on Theater Road adjacent to the intersection of State Routes 19 and 20 is proposed for inclusion in the General Crossroad rural commercial district.

Proponent	Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) as initiating proponent and on behalf of two entities which have offered suggested amendments
Lead Agency	Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD) Long-Range Planning 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend WA 98368 Responsible Official: Al Scalf, Director DCD (360) 379-4493 Contact Person: Josh D. Peters, Senior Planner DCD Long-Range Planning (360) 379-4466
Authors and Principal Contributors	Jefferson County Department of Community Development Long-Range Planning
Date of Staff Report & SEPA Addendum Issuance	September 22, 2004
Date Comments are Due	Oral comments are welcome at the Planning Commission public hearing, 6:30 PM, Wednesday, October 6, 2004, at the WSU Community Learning Center in Hadlock. Written comments are accepted by DCD on behalf of the Planning Commission through Wednesday, October 13, 2004.
Past Related Actions and Future Anticipated Actions	County staff hosted a roundtable workshop for the public on on September 7. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing on October 6. DCD expects to transmit to the BOCC in mid-November a final DCD Staff Recommendation together with the Planning Commission Recommendation for all four proposals on the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket.
Tentative Adoption Date	A legislative decision from the BOCC on each of the four Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals and associated UDC amendments under consideration is expected in December. The meeting schedules and agendas for the Planning Commission and BOCC with regard to this Docket are available on a Jefferson County website dedicated to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment cycle process. This website can be accessed from the Jefferson County homepage: http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us

Appeal Information

Issues relating to the adequacy of a SEPA Addendum and other procedural issues may not be appealed under the administrative appeal provisions of UDC 8.10.12. Appeals of GMA actions (i.e., a legislative decision by the BOCC) are heard first by the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board.

Location of Background Material and Documents Incorporated by Reference

Background material and documents used to support development of the Addendum are available for inspection from 9:00 AM to 4:30 PM, Monday through Friday, at the Jefferson County Department of Community Development, 621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend WA 98368, (360) 379-4450.

Relation to Other Documents

A series of documents have been prepared by or on behalf of Jefferson County to evaluate the impacts of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations—the Unified Development Code (UDC)—inclusive of amendments. These documents, listed in part 3 of this document, “Supporting Record, Analyses, and Materials,” provide substantial background information and offer previous environmental description and analysis. They are hereby incorporated by reference. The reader is encouraged to utilize existing documents in conjunction with this document for more comprehensive perspective and understanding.

In this document, description of and references to the content of the proposals have been provided to the greatest extent possible, but are not inclusive of all relevant information from the Comprehensive Plan amendment applications. For optimum understanding of the discussion presented here, the Comprehensive Plan amendment applications themselves should be consulted as companion information to this document.

Cost to the Public

Copies of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket DCD Integrated Staff Report and SEPA Addendum, or select pages, are available at cost from the Jefferson County Department of Community Development (DCD). The text and selected appendices are also available for download on the DCD website dedicated to the 2004 annual amendment cycle, which can be accessed from the Jefferson County homepage: <http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us>. Copies of this document are available for inspection at DCD and the Jefferson County Public Library at Port Hadlock.

1.2 ENVIRONMENTAL SUMMARY

1.2.1 Introduction and Process

Jefferson County adopted a comprehensive plan pursuant to the Growth Management Act (GMA) on August 28, 1998. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan is a policy document that guides growth and future land use decisions in Jefferson County. In each successive year, the County has conducted a Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle as provided by the GMA. The process for amending the Comprehensive Plan is outlined in Section 9 of the Unified Development Code (UDC), which is the set of development regulations adopted in December 2000 to implement the Comprehensive Plan. The 2004 "Preliminary Docket" included five (5) proposed amendments and associated UDC amendments. All of the proposed amendments are considered suggested amendments, as opposed to site-specific amendments (formal applications submitted in conjunction with a fee). The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) adopted Resolution 91-03 in 2003, thereby limiting the 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle to suggested amendments only. The Jefferson County Planning Commission held a public hearing on the Preliminary Docket and formulated a recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) regarding the composition of the "Final Docket." The BOCC then established the Final Docket, accepting each of the five suggested amendments.

One of those items, under file number MLA04-29, involved urban growth area (UGA) planning in the Irondale and Port Hadlock area of unincorporated Jefferson County. The BOCC enacted Comprehensive Plan amendments related to the UGA in August, apart from the other items on the 2004 Docket, as part of a growth management compliance schedule. Four (4) items remain on the 2004 Docket for consideration this autumn. These four are the subject of this report.

This document is an integrated Staff Report and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Addendum. The objective is to analyze the proposed amendments individually and cumulatively with regard to Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria outlined in UDC Section 9 and potential environmental impacts as proscribed in SEPA. Adoption of Comprehensive Plan amendments is a non-project action under SEPA and the analysis presented in this document is not intended to satisfy individual project action SEPA requirements (i.e., the review needed for a future land use or building permit application). This is an integrated GMA/SEPA document that combines environmental analysis with a Staff Report offering recommended action on each proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment.² Guidance for a GMA document integrated with a SEPA Addendum is found at Washington Administrative Code (WAC) 197-11-235. The analysis in this document supplements adopted environmental documents and those incorporated by reference.

1.2.1.1 Adoption of Existing Environmental Documents

The following existing environmental documents have been adopted through legal notice published on September 22, 2004 (Appendix Item 1):

- Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements (DEIS/FEIS) and addenda prepared in anticipation of adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1998. The DEIS and FEIS are dated February 24, 1997 and May 27, 1998, respectively, and examined the potential cumulative environmental impacts of adopting alternative versions of the Comprehensive Plan.

² A staff recommendation for Part B of file number MLA04-28 is not included in this report. Part B is the Planning Commission recommendation for amending the Comprehensive Plan based on a five-year assessment. Staff will provide the Planning Commission with analysis and a preliminary recommendation for Part B of MLA04-28 via memorandum in the month of October, during Planning Commission deliberations on the 2004 Docket.

1.2.1.2 Incorporation of Documents by Reference

The four subject Comprehensive Plan amendment applications themselves, including all supplemental information submitted with or associated with the applications, all supporting record, analyses, and materials listed in part 3 of this document, all Appendix Items to this report, and all other materials or documents referenced in the text within are hereby incorporated by reference, pursuant to SEPA rules at WAC 197-11-600 and 635.

The documents listed in part 3 of this document, “Supporting Record, Analyses, and Materials,” provide substantial background information and offer previous environmental description and analysis. The reader is encouraged to utilize existing documents in conjunction with this document for more comprehensive perspective and understanding.

Moreover, throughout this document description of and references to the content of the proposals have been provided to the greatest extent possible, but are not inclusive of all relevant information from the Comprehensive Plan amendment applications. For optimum understanding of the discussion presented here, the Comprehensive Plan amendment applications themselves should be consulted as companion information to this document.

1.2.1.3 Level of Environmental Analysis

This document provides qualitative and quantitative analysis of environmental impacts as appropriate to the general nature of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket proposals. The adoption of comprehensive plan amendments is classified under SEPA as a non-project (i.e., programmatic) action. A non-project action, such as decisions on policies, plans or programs, is defined as an action that is broader than a single site-specific project. Environmental analysis for a non-project proposal does not require site-specific analyses; instead, a document such as an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a SEPA Addendum discusses impacts and alternatives appropriate to the scope of the non-project proposal and to the level of planning for the proposal (WAC 197-11-442). The analysis in this document is not intended to satisfy individual project action SEPA requirements (i.e., the review needed for a future land use or building permit application).

SEPA encourages the use of phased environmental review to focus on issues that are ready for decision, and to exclude from consideration issues already decided or not yet ready for decision-making [WAC 197-11-060(5)]. Phased review is appropriate when the sequence of a proposal is from a programmatic document, such as an integrated GMA/SEPA document addressing comprehensive plan amendments, to other documents that are narrower in scope, such as for a site-specific, project-level analysis (i.e., a “project action” under SEPA).

Jefferson County is employing the phased review concept in its environmental review of growth management planning actions. The analysis in this Staff Report and SEPA Addendum will be used to review the potential environmental impacts of the proposed amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (and associated proposed amendments to the Unified Development Code). Additional environmental review of development proposals will occur as specific projects are proposed (e.g., land use and building permit applications). This will result in an additional incremental level of review when subsequent implementing actions require a more detailed evaluation and as additional information becomes available. Future project action environmental review for development applications that are not categorically exempt from SEPA could occur in the form of a supplemental EIS, SEPA addendum, or threshold Determination of Non-Significance (DNS).

1.2.1.4 Process and Public Involvement

Following is a description of the anticipated review and public involvement process for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket and associated Staff Report and SEPA Addendum.

This 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket DCD Staff Report and SEPA Addendum is available to agencies and interested parties pursuant to GMA and SEPA rules. Comments on the merits of the proposals shall be accepted as outlined below under “Public Comment Period.”

1.2.1.4.1 Preliminary Public Outreach

County staff collaborated with the Washington State Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED) and the Planning Association of Washington (PAW) to host a “Short Course on Local Planning” for the public on August 9, 2004. The Short Course covers the legal basis for and fundamentals of land use planning in Washington state. The August 9 Short Course held in the Tri-Area Community Center also focused on the statutory requirements for conducting the “2004 Update” (Part A of MLA04-28).

On September 1, the Planning Commission finalized its public review proposal for amending the Comprehensive Plan according to a five-year assessment (Part B of MLA04-28). The proposal was posted on the web for preliminary public review shortly thereafter.

County staff hosted a roundtable workshop for the public on September 7 at the WSU Community Learning Center in Hadlock. The subject of the workshop was the mandatory “2004 Update” (Part A of MLA04-28) and draft materials developed by County staff in response to the GMA requirements. Pre-release versions of staff-prepared drafts of the Capital Facilities and Transportation elements of the Comprehensive Plan were posted on the web for preliminary public review.

1.2.1.4.2 Planning Commission Public Hearing

The Jefferson County Planning Commission is scheduled to hold at least one public hearing to take testimony on the proposed Comprehensive Plan and associated UDC amendments that compose the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket (2004 Docket). A public hearing is scheduled for **Wednesday, October 6, 2004, 6:30 PM** at the **WSU Community Learning Center**, pertaining to all items on the 2004 Docket.

The September 22 release of this Staff Report and SEPA Addendum on the suggested amendments that compose the 2004 Docket initiates a public comment period that remains open through Wednesday, October 13. Oral comment may be provided to the Planning Commission at the October 6 public hearing. Written comment may be submitted to the Planning Commission via DCD through October 13. The Planning Commission may elect at its discretion to schedule an additional date and time for oral comments.

This combined Staff Report and SEPA Addendum is available at DCD and on the DCD web pages for public and agency use prior to the Planning Commission public hearing on the suggested amendments that compose the 2004 Docket.

1.2.1.4.3 Public Comment Period

The Planning Commission will accept **oral comments** on the four suggested amendments at the **October 6, 2004 public hearing** cited above. DCD and the Planning Commission will accept **written comments** on the four suggested amendments through **Wednesday, October 13**. Written comments on the proposals may be submitted to DCD at 621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend WA 98368 or via email to planning@co.jefferson.wa.us. Comments submitted prior to the close of the comment period will be forwarded to the Planning Commission for consideration during that advisory body’s deliberations. Written public comments submitted after October 13 will be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) for consideration in its legislative decision. The BOCC may hold a public hearing before taking action on the Final Docket (formal notice would appear in the newspaper of record, the *Port Townsend & Jefferson County Leader*).

1.2.1.4.4 Availability of Documents

For more information or to inspect or request copies of the original applications for the proposed amendments, the adopted existing environmental documents or other related information, contact DCD Long-Range Planning at the mail or email addresses above, by phone at (360) 379-4450, or visit the 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle webpage, where as many relevant documents and maps as possible are available in Portable Document Format (PDF). The 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle webpage can be accessed through the County homepage: <http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us>.

1.2.1.4.5 Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners Deliberation

Following the public hearing(s) on the Docket, the Planning Commission deliberates on the proposals, potentially over a series of meetings, and formulates a recommendation on each proposal to the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC). It is anticipated that the Planning Commission will deliberate on the proposed suggested amendments during regularly scheduled meetings October 20 and November 3, or until such time that it formulates a recommendation for transmittal to the BOCC. The Planning Commission generally meets the first and third Wednesdays of any given month at the WSU Community Learning Center, Shold Business Park, 201 W Patison, Port Hadlock. It is possible that the Planning Commission will hold one or more special meetings outside of the regular meeting schedule. The most likely dates for these meetings would be October 13 and/or October 27. Following the completion of the Planning Commission recommendation on the 2004 Docket, DCD will formerly transmit the Planning Commission recommendation to the BOCC in conjunction with the DCD final staff recommendation, based on continuing review, comments submitted during the public comment period, and the Planning Commission deliberation and recommendation. It is anticipated that the Planning Commission and DCD recommendations will be presented to the BOCC on or near Monday, November 15.

In making a final legislative decision on the Docket, the BOCC considers the Planning Commission recommendation, the full case record of the Docket (all comments provided to the Planning Commission, the minutes of the Planning Commission meetings, and other background information), the DCD staff recommendation that accompanies the Planning Commission recommendation, legal advice from the Prosecuting Attorney's office, and any written or oral comments provided to the BOCC before or during a BOCC public hearing on the Docket (should one be held). If the BOCC elects to schedule one or more public hearings on the Docket following receipt of the Planning Commission recommendation, there would be another opportunity for agencies and the public to provide formal comments on the Docket. A legal notice would appear in the *Port Townsend & Jefferson County Leader*, the publication of record, announcing any BOCC public hearings on the 2004 Docket. A BOCC public hearing has been tentatively scheduled for Monday, December 6, 2004.

A legislative decision from the BOCC on each of the four Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals under consideration and any associated UDC amendments is expected in December 2004. The meeting schedules and agendas for the Planning Commission and BOCC with regard to the 2004 Docket are available on a Jefferson County webpage dedicated to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan annual amendment cycle process. This webpage can be accessed from the Jefferson County homepage: <http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us>.

1.2.2 Major Conclusions

The summary conclusions and/or highlights from the analysis in Part 2 of this Staff Report and SEPA Addendum are presented here for the reader's convenience. A reading of the analysis in Part 2 in addition to any supporting material referenced in the text, including Appendix Items, is encouraged. Generally, information presented elsewhere is *not* reprinted here.

1.2.2.1 Summary Matrix of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The complete description of the proposals, analysis of impacts, and recommendation for mitigation measures and conditions are within the individual staff reports for each of the proposed amendments found in part 2 of this document—“Concise Analysis of the Proposals”—or among the Appendix Items, as appropriate. Summary statements presented in the Summary Matrix are, in some cases, considerably abbreviated from the full discussion in part 2 and lack explanations of terminology. Readers are encouraged to review the more comprehensive discussion of issues of interest in part 2, and to consult the Appendix Items, the amendment applications themselves, and other supporting materials listed in part 3, in order to formulate the most accurate impression of impacts associated with the proposals and staff recommendations.

“Significant” as used in SEPA means a reasonable likelihood of more than a moderate adverse impact on environmental quality. Significance involves context and intensity and does not lend itself to a formula or quantifiable text (WAC 197-11-794).

#	APPLICATION NUMBER & DESCRIPTION	POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS	PROPOSED MITIGATION / CONDITIONS
1	MLA03-232; Port of Port Townsend; Jefferson County International Airport	Not significant.	Adopt proposal as modified by staff. Uses at the Airport will be considered in a future planning process.
2	MLA03-244; People for a Rural Quimper; Jefferson County International Airport	Not significant.	Do not adopt suggested amendments.
3	MLA04-27; Jefferson County; Designation of Parcels as Agricultural Lands	Not significant.	Re-designate parcels to Agricultural Lands except those <i>not</i> recommended by the Planning Commission Agricultural Lands Committee.
4	MLA04-28; Jefferson County; Comprehensive Plan Assessment and Update	Not significant.	Staff analysis and recommendation for Part B of MLA04-28 to be provided to the Planning Commission in October.

1.2.2.2 Comparison of Current and Proposed Land Use District Designations

The following table displays the (approximate) current number of acres within each land use district (from the Comprehensive Plan, County Geographic Information System database, and other sources), and the proposed change in the number of acres under each district under the proposals. The reader should understand that these numbers are approximations for planning purposes only. They do not necessarily represent the actual numbers of acres on the ground. They are, however, the best approximation available

at this time. The purpose of the table is to set a context for the legislative decision before the Board of County Commissioners for this year's amendment cycle.

The acreage figures in the table for east Jefferson County land use designations are in gross acres, including road rights-of-way and some water features. The net acreage would be lower. The figures for west Jefferson County are in net acreage.

The Airport Essential Public Facility designation as suggested by the Port of Port Townsend (MLA03-232), the Agricultural Lands proposal (MLA04-27), and a suggested re-designation of one parcel by the Planning Commission (Part B of MLA04-28) are the only proposed amendments with direct influence on the map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations.

Jefferson County Land Use Designations	EAST COUNTY GROSS ACRES	AG REZONE ACRES	SR 19/20 DRIVE- INE REZONE	UGA CHANGE ACRES	FINAL GROSS ACRES	WEST COUNTY NET ACRES
Rural Residential (1:5)	29,555	(388)		(1,008)	28,160	
Rural Residential (1:10)	8,237	(204)	(24)	(97)	7,913	1,918
Rural Residential (1:20)	28,869	(2,129)		(22)	26,717	24,682
Port Townsend Urban Growth Area*	4,466				4,466	
Rural Village Centers (Hadlock, Brinnon, Quilcene)	242	(7)		(94)	141	
General Crossroads	96		24	(69)	51	
Convenience Crossroads	10				10	
Neighborhood Crossroads	122				122	
UGA-Commercial				262	262	
UGA-Light Industrial				25	25	
UGA-Medium Density Residential 7-14				66	66	
UGA-High Density Residential 14-24				50	50	
UGA-Public				72	72	
UGA-Low Density Residential 4-6				802	802	
UGA-Visitor Oriented Commercial				14	14	
MPR-Single Family Tracts (1:2.5)	114				114	
MPR-Single Family (4:1)	1,431				1,431	
MPR-Multiple Family (10:1)	75				75	
MPR-Resort Complex (10:1)	57				57	
MPR-Recreation Area	259				259	
MPR-Village Commercial Center	43				43	
MPR-Open Space Reserve	356				356	
Parks, Preserves, Recreation - Not MPR	2,861			(1)	2,859	
Rural Forest	8,645	(352)			8,293	3,938
Commercial Forest	74,958	(500)			74,458	235,440
Inholding Forest	4,694	(2)			4,692	2,534
Resource Based Industrial Zone (Center, Gardiner)	30				30	122
Commercial Agriculture	4,329				4,329	
Agricultural Lands of Local Importance	79				79	
Heavy Industry (Mill)	278				278	
Light Industrial (Glen Cove)	72				72	
Light Industrial/Manufacturing (Quilcene, Eastview, Brinnon)	56				56	
Light Industrial/Commercial (Glen Cove)	90				90	
Airport EPF	289				289	
Military Reservation	3,452				3,452	
Waste Management EPF	241				241	
TOTAL	174,004	(3,583)			170,421	268,633

1.2.2.3 Significant Unavoidable Adverse Impacts

Conclusions as to whether an impact would be considered significant, unavoidable, and adverse are found in the Summary Matrix above. Many of those conclusions contain assumptions about the ability to plan future development proposals in a way that would minimize impacts, or assumptions about how mitigation measures or existing regulations would be applied. Based upon use, regulation, and mitigation assumptions, none of the potential impacts of the future development scenarios evaluated in this document would meet all of the parameters (significant *and* unavoidable *and* adverse). The staff recommendation includes recommended mitigation measures that go beyond the regulatory framework currently in place. For more information on the relationship of plan and policymaking to future review of development permit applications, review the discussion on Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures below at section 1.2.4.2.

1.2.3 Significant Areas of Controversy and Uncertainty

Following is a table summarizing key environmental issues and options facing decision-makers:

#	APPLICATION NUMBER & DESCRIPTION	AREAS OF CONTROVERSY AND UNCERTAINTY
1	MLA03-232; Port of Port Townsend; Jefferson County International Airport	The City of Port Townsend and members of People for a Livable Community, a citizen group, have expressed concern about uses at the Airport and Port-owned adjacent property. See the note below about the establishment of an Airport Overlay based on a noise contour map that includes disclosure provisions.
2	MLA03-244; People for a Rural Quimper; Jefferson County International Airport	The members of People for a Rural Quimper are concerned that the establishment of an Airport Noise Overlay will affect property values in the area. The Group proposes the removal of all language in the Comprehensive Plan that references an Airport Noise Overlay.
3	MLA04-27; Jefferson County; Designation of Parcels as Agricultural Lands	The main area of potential controversy with regard to the amending the categories and criteria for designating Agricultural Lands is the possibility that parcels smaller than five acres (the current limitation for consideration) be designated in the future. Some owners of neighboring properties designated as Rural Residential and used for that purpose may be opposed to Agricultural Lands designation for their neighbors.
4	MLA04-28; Jefferson County; Comprehensive Plan Assessment and Update	Uncertainty lingers about what exactly local jurisdictions are required to do for the mandatory growth management updates. The five-year assessment conducted by the Planning Commission was used to update narrative language and policy. Some may be uncomfortable with a “re-write” of the Comprehensive Plan.

1.2.4 Issues to Be Resolved

1.2.4.1 Environmental Choices to Be Made

The Comprehensive Plan states that, “a healthy environment is fundamental to the quality of life of its citizens” and further provides four essential components for environmental protection:

- Watershed and Fish Habitat Recovery Management Strategy
- Regulatory Strategy for Consolidated Environmental Review
- Critical Area Protection Strategy and
- Public Education and Involvement Strategy

Each choice taken by the County and its residents may impact environmental quality. Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives are implemented through development regulations in the Unified Development Code (UDC). The UDC was developed such that protective measures are incorporated into permit decisions. (For more discussion on how this process functions, refer to 1.2.4.2 below.)

The four suggested Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals on this year’s Docket may have the potential, if adopted, to affect the environment. For this reason, each proposal must be carefully analyzed for potential impacts and, if necessary, either denied, conditioned, or modified appropriately.

1.2.4.2 Effectiveness of Mitigation Measures

The legislative adoption of Comprehensive Plan amendments is a non-project action under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). A project action would be a decision on a land use or building permit reviewed under the general policy framework offered by the Comprehensive Plan and its implementing regulations. SEPA review is required for project actions, unless those actions are categorically exempt from SEPA review when the proposal is compared to the list of exemption thresholds at WAC 197-11-800. Environmental review such as the analysis contained in this document is useful and essential at the non-project level in order to set up a regulatory framework that protects the environment. Mitigation for non-project actions in this sense is essentially the extent to which the established regulatory framework is effective when applied to future development proposals. Generally, mitigation measures would not be required for the programmatic action of adopting a Comprehensive Plan or development regulation amendment, but may be useful and appropriate to address probable significant adverse environmental impacts identified at the non-project level. It is often the case that project action environmental review is where specific mitigation measures can be applied to condition a proposal such that the approval and execution of the proposal does not present a significant adverse environmental impact. With regard to environmental review of this year’s Comprehensive Plan annual amendment cycle docket, it is helpful to understand that Jefferson County has in place a regulatory framework that follows the guidance established in Washington State laws, such as SEPA, GMA, and the Shoreline Management Act (SMA).

Jefferson County adopted the Unified Development Code (UDC) in December 2000 (effective January 16, 2001) as the unified set of development regulations to implement the Comprehensive Plan adopted in August 1998. Until the adoption of the UDC, the Comprehensive Plan was implemented through a variety of separate ordinances, some in place prior to the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The Interim Controls Ordinance proscribed allowed uses in the land use districts of the Comprehensive Plan land use map and the Land Use Procedures Ordinances outlined the permit process and related administrative matters. The UDC replaced these and other previously existing ordinances.

Among the replaced ordinances was the Critical Areas Ordinance. Protective measures for what are now called “environmentally sensitive areas” are contained at UDC section 3.6.4, et al. Environmentally sensitive areas are protected through the application of overlay districts. Examples of such overlay districts include Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (UDC 3.6.5), Frequently Flooded Areas (UDC 3.6.6),

Geologically Hazardous Areas (UDC 3.6.7), Fish and Wildlife Habitat Areas (UDC 3.6.8), and Wetlands (3.6.9). The County maintains data from a variety of sources, including the State of the Washington and the US Federal government, in a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) database. The data are used to create maps depicting the environmentally sensitive areas overlay districts.

Development Review Division planners utilize available GIS information when reviewing land use and building permit applications and apply the protective measures accordingly. Oftentimes, an applicant is required to submit a Special Report, such as an Aquifer Recharge Area Report, Drainage and Erosion Control Plan, Geotechnical Report, Grading Plan, Habitat Management Plan, and Wetland Delineation Report. The contents of these Special Reports are governed by UDC section 3.6.10. Submitted Special Reports are used not only to condition land use and building permit approval, but whenever possible to augment existing data for the County GIS database on environmentally sensitive areas.

Sometimes the existing regulations are not strong enough to effectively protect the environment when examined in the context of a particular project. Depending on the particular aspects of a development proposal, mitigation measures above and beyond the protections provided by the established development regulations may be needed to avoid significant adverse environmental impacts. In these cases, jurisdictions may employ “SEPA substantive authority” to further condition approval of a development application. These mitigation measures are generally developed through project action SEPA review and established as permit conditions through an EIS or a threshold Mitigated Determination of Non-significance (MDNS).

Consideration of mitigation measures that correspond with adoption of any one of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments in this year’s cycle is not as clear as placing a condition on a permit. The legislative decision to adopt a modified version of the original Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal can be considered a form of mitigation, for example. The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) may be effectively mitigating the potential environmental impact of adopting a Comprehensive Plan amendment by adopting a modified proposal or even deciding not to adopt the proposal based on environmental considerations. For formal site-specific amendment applications, the BOCC could apply a mitigation measure that affects future use of the land in question. In any of these cases, mitigation as applied to a non-project action such as a Comprehensive Plan amendment is distinct from mitigation as applied to a land use or building permit approval. It is at the time of project action review that established protection measures for environmentally sensitive areas and other development standards are applied to proposals for on-the-ground development. Judging the effectiveness of mitigation measures in this context requires on-going vigilance.

1.2.4.3 Main Options to Be Preserved or Foreclosed by the Action

The key decisions to be made by county officials as a result of this analysis are typical of Comprehensive Planning processes, including accommodating growth and providing services, while protecting the natural environment and the lifestyle valued by Jefferson County residents. The proposals, including the various components of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update, must meet GMA mandates, but must also be consistent with the County-Wide Planning Policies. Since the county cannot stop growing, it is impossible to entirely avoid the adverse impacts associated with growth. Jefferson County has planned to accommodate the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) 2024 population projections. Long-term local impacts from growth include increased urbanization, cumulative impacts to fish and wildlife habitat, decreased transportation levels of service, and increased demand for infrastructure and facilities. The County will continue to plan for distribution of growth that will result in the lowest levels of environmental impacts, focus on infill, and balance capital investments.

The crucial planning decision that must be made in relation to the Jefferson County International Airport proposals is maintaining the long-term viability of the airport and planning for its ability to accommodate future growth while protecting it from encroaching development and incompatible uses. Similarly, key to the Agricultural Lands planning effort decision is the protection of various environmentally and commercially significant agriculturally-used lands to maintain the long-term viability while protecting

them from encroaching, often opposing uses. These become fundamental in view of the public interest to live in a rural setting of such high quality as that which is enjoyed in Jefferson County. The County will continue to designate lands in a manner that reduces pressures to convert land into sprawling low-density development.

The primary issue facing decision-makers for the site-specific rezone request portion of MLA 04-28 is compatibility with surrounding uses. The central decision in the issue of critical areas protection is use of the most up-to-date scientific protocols adopted as industry standards. The protocols, if approved, will be integrated into UDC-based development guidance to reduce environmental risk.

2 Concise Analysis of the Proposals

2.1 OVERVIEW

Pursuant to Section 9 of the Unified Development Code (UDC), Jefferson County is conducting an annual Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Consistent with the State Environmental Policy Act (“SEPA” at RCW 43.21C), the Growth Management Act (“GMA” at RCW 36.70A), the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, and UDC Section 9, this amendment process involves concurrent analysis of all proposals to review the potential for cumulative impacts.

In general, Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals in Jefferson County fall into one of two (2) categories:

Formal Site-Specific Amendments are proposals submitted by property owners requesting a change in either Comprehensive plan land use designation or density.

Suggested Amendments are generally limited to proposals that broadly apply to the goals, policies and implementation strategies of the Comprehensive Plan. In order to ensure cumulative impact review, suggested amendments that could potentially result in re-designation of groups of parcels are analyzed using the same criteria required for formal site-specific amendments (i.e., UDC 9.8.1.b and c).

This document addresses the four (4) suggested Comprehensive Plan amendments on the Final Docket. There are no formal, site-specific amendments on the 2004 Docket pursuant to Resolution 91-03 adopted by the Board of County Commissioners in 2003. This document further divides the suggested amendments into sub-categories.

2.1.1 Staff Reports, Cumulative Analysis, and Staff Recommendations

Part 2 of this document addresses specific criteria contained in Section 9 of the UDC and, in turn, evaluates the potential for adverse environmental and cumulative impacts. Each amendment proposal is described below, evaluated based on the required criteria, and a staff recommendation is made based on those criteria. Tables are for summary information only; consult the staff report for each proposal for greater comprehension.

2.1.2 Growth Management Indicators

Pursuant to UDC section 9.8.1.b, all recommendations regarding amendment to the Comprehensive Plan must include an inquiry into the seven (7) growth management indicators listed at UDC section 9.5.4.b. These growth management indicators address:

- Growth and development rates
- Ability to provide services
- Availability of urban land
- Community-wide attitudes towards land use
- Consistency with state law and local agreements

These indicators are not necessarily amendment-specific but rather are meant to provide a snapshot of Jefferson County’s status during this 2004 amendment cycle. This section will serve to promote consideration and inquiry into these seven growth management indicators and is intended to be a starting point for broader community consideration before the Planning Commission and the BOCC. While this

review of the growth management indicators provides some basic analysis related to County demographics, it is not intended to measure progress in achieving the goals of the Comprehensive Plan; that task is reserved for the State-mandated Comprehensive Plan update scheduled for completion in 2004.

Unified Development Code (UDC) Section 9.5.4.b – growth management indicators

Each of the growth management indicators is discussed as listed in Section 9.5.4.b of the UDC.

(1) Whether growth and development as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan is occurring faster or slower than anticipated, or is failing to materialize.

Discussion: The Office of Financial Management (OFM) is the State agency responsible for compiling population projections under the Growth Management Act (GMA). The OFM Population Determination for Jefferson County, based on a corrected Federal Census count in 2000, shows a year 2003 population of 26,700. The 1996 “base year” population estimate used in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan (see page 3-3) was identified as 25,754 residents. The 1998 Comprehensive Plan predicted a population of 28,482 in 2000, 2,529 less than the 2000 census.

The County has passed Resolution #55-03 which adopted the intermediate population projection from OFM for 2000-2024. The population projection predicts a population of 40,139 in 2024, an annual growth rate of 1.78%. The early 1990s were a time of rapid growth in Jefferson County, and the population projections that were reflective of the unusual amount of growth at that time. The growth rate of 1.78% is more in line with the historical growth rate of approximately 2%.

That being said, growth trends are difficult to predict. Washington state and its counties have tended to exhibit growth spurts interrupted by periods of slower growth, stagnation, and even decline. For example, the “rural rebound” growth trend experienced by most western states in the early 1990s – at the time of GMA adoption – was the result of an exodus by nearly two million people leaving California during a severe regional economic recession. Rural and non-metropolitan growth in Washington, and Jefferson County, during the 1990s was far greater than anticipated but slowed as California’s economy recovered in the mid-1990s (“Washington State County Population Projections For Growth Management,” Office of Financial Management, March 2002).

YEAR	1910	1920	1930	1940	1950	1960	1970	1980	1990	2001
County Population	8300	6420	8346	8918	11618	9639	10661	15965	20406	26299
Port Townsend	4181	2847	3970	4683	6888	5074	5241	6067	7001	8430
Percent in Port Townsend	50%	44%	47%	53%	59%	53%	49%	38%	34%	32%

Jefferson County Population 1910-2001

Source: United States Census, Washington State Office of Financial Management

As reference to the table above indicates, an interesting trend for Jefferson County is an ongoing decrease in the percentage of residents living in the city of Port Townsend. Since 1950, the percentage of residents living in the city has dropped from 59% to 32%, with County residential units accounting for nearly 70% of the population base. It is not unreasonable to assume that this shift towards residence in unincorporated areas has resulted in an increased demand for services outside of Port Townsend.

Resolution #55-03 allocates 36% of the growth over the 20-year planning period to the City of Port Townsend, 17% each to Port Ludlow MPR and Irondale/Hadlock UGA, and 30% to the rural areas of Jefferson County.

(2) Whether the capacity of the county to provide adequate services has diminished or increased.

Discussion: The number of service providers in the County has not decreased and the County, with the exception of policy decisions made as a result of economic conditions, continues to be equipped to provide the same level of services available at the time of Comprehensive Plan adoption. The County has adopted plans to provide the Irondale/Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA) with urban services, specifically sanitary sewer service and stormwater management.

(3) Whether sufficient urban land is designated and zoned to meet projected demand and need.

Discussion: As a part of the planning process for the designation of the UGA an analysis of vacant lands within the UGA and a buildout analysis was completed and evaluated the ability to accommodate the population allocated to the UGA. The UGA was sized to accommodate 118% of the growth allocated by resolution #55-03.

Based on the City of Port Townsend "2002 Annual Comprehensive Plan Assessment" dated April 15, 2002, there appears to be adequate vacant land in all zoning categories to accommodate future anticipated urban growth.

(4) Whether any assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer found to be valid.

Discussion: Since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1998, the majority of assumptions made as part of the Plan continue to be valid. Amendments to GMA and other laws made by the State Legislature and precedent-setting decisions made by the Growth Management Hearings Boards influence local government implementation of GMA.

Jefferson County has completed a "Regional Economic Analysis and Forecast" (Richard Trotter: January 26, 1999) that suggests that the County has a deficit that exceeds 200 acres of commercially and industrially zoned land. This analysis, which was referenced and anticipated in the Comprehensive Plan, provides general direction for the County regarding the designation of rural commercial lands and/or Urban Growth Areas.

(5) Whether changes in countywide attitudes necessitate amendments to the goals of the Plan and the basic values embodied within the Comprehensive Plan Vision Statement.

Discussion: The most effective way to judge whether changes in countywide attitudes have occurred, aside from reference to local election results, is through statistically significant public opinion surveys. The last such survey in Jefferson County took place in 1991 through the "Jefferson 2000 Public Opinion Survey" conducted by Elway Research. Many of the opinions expressed through this survey are reflected in the policy assumptions that form the basis for the Comprehensive Plan. That said, the opinions expressed through the Jefferson 2000 survey were not intended to predict the future and an updated survey would be the most effective way to gauge whether changes in countywide attitudes have actually manifested.

(6) Whether changes in circumstances dictate a need for amendments.

Discussion: To some degree, circumstances have changed since Comprehensive Plan adoption in August of 1998. Taken from a broad perspective, these changing circumstances include: issues surrounding affordable housing, specific salmon species listings under the Endangered Species Act, County adoption of final development regulations which are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and the Growth

Management Act, Growth Management Hearings Boards clarifications through case law related to specific provisions of the GMA, the adoption of Unified Development Code amendments establishing a process for locating Major Industrial Development, the completion of the Tri-Area/Glen Cove Special Study, designation of Glen Cove Light Industrial/Commercial area, and the designation of Irondale/Hadlock as a UGA.

Changes in circumstance such as these suggest that components of the Comprehensive Plan may need to be amended.

(7) Whether inconsistencies exist between the Comprehensive Plan and the Growth Management Act or the Comprehensive Plan and the County-Wide Planning Policy for Jefferson County.

Discussion: While the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with both the Growth Management Act and the Countywide Planning Policy. Pursuant to the Growth Management Act, the County is in the process of conducting a review of the Comprehensive Plan and the UDC to ensure consistency between those documents and the Growth Management Act. Per the GMA, this review must be completed in 2004.

2.2 FINAL DOCKET

Following are brief descriptions of each of the four (4)³ proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Each case has a Master Land Use Application (MLA) file number for reference. Each of the proposed amendments is considered a suggested amendment, as opposed to a formal, site-specific amendment.

1. **MLA03-232** proposed by the Port of Port Townsend suggesting the following: (1) Proposes an Essential Public Facilities (EPF) district designation rather than an overlay for the Jefferson County Airport (JCIA); (2) proposes the establishment of an Airport Overlay based on a 55-DNL noise contour map projected through the year 2022 and adopted in 2004 with the Airport Master Plan (AMP); (3) proposes Comprehensive Plan and UDC changes related to the allowed and prohibited land uses within the Airport EPF and the Airport Overlay; (4) proposes a disclosure process by which prospective property owners and current owners who apply for certain land use approvals in the Airport Overlay would be informed about the close proximity to the JCIA and that the County does not consider noise impacts related to normal airport operations to be a public nuisance; and (5) proposes a future planning process in which industrial uses would be considered in or adjacent to the Airport EPF in order to promote Airport self-sustainability.
2. **MLA03-244** proposed by a citizen group, People for a Rural Quimper (PRQ), suggesting the following: Proposed Comprehensive Plan policy changes related to the elimination of requirements for Jefferson County to adopt an Airport Overlay or Noise Overlay ordinance and to support implementation of Airport Master Plan policies regarding land use at the Jefferson County International Airport.
3. **MLA04-27** proposed by Jefferson County suggesting the following: Proposal to consider a set of 253 parcels of land for designation as Agricultural Lands on the map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations. The full parcel list is included and analyzed in the available Staff Report. This process is the final step in an Agricultural Lands planning effort initiated early last year and intended to complete tasks identified in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.
4. **MLA04-28** proposed by Jefferson County suggesting the following: Part A of this proposal consists of Comprehensive Plan and UDC amendments developed by staff as part of the statutory

³ The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket was established earlier this year by the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) with five (5) items. One of those items, under file number MLA04-29, involved urban growth area (UGA) planning in the Irondale and Port Hadlock area of unincorporated Jefferson County. The BOCC enacted Comprehensive Plan amendments related to the UGA in August, apart from the other items on the 2004 Docket, as part of a growth management compliance schedule. Four items remain on the 2004 Docket for consideration this autumn.

2004 growth management update requirements in the Growth Management Act (GMA), Chapter 36.70A. The principal areas for consideration are population allocation, capital facilities and transportation planning, and best available science as applied to the regulatory protection of environmentally critical areas. Part B involves a Planning Commission five-year assessment of the Comprehensive Plan and corresponding amendment proposal pursuant to UDC Section 9.5.4. The Planning Commission proposal is intended to replace or eliminate outdated, redundant, and regulatory language and includes amendments to the following Comprehensive Plan chapters: Introduction; Plan Implementation and Monitoring; Land Use and Rural; Housing; Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation; Economic Development; and Environment. The Planning Commission proposal also includes one site-specific land use re-designation involving 18 acres currently zoned Rural Residential 1:10 and occupied by the Wheel-In Motor Movie drive-in theater. Parcel number 001-282-007 located on Theater Road adjacent to the intersection of State Routes 19 and 20 is proposed for inclusion in the General Crossroad rural commercial district.

The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) in its legislative capacity may adopt each amendment as proposed, adopt with conditions, adopt a modified version, or deny adoption.

The four proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan constitute, for the purposes of the integrated Staff Report and SEPA Addendum, four individual proposed action components. The only environmental review-based alternative to each proposed action component is No Action, which would be continuation of application of the Comprehensive Plan without any or all of the four proposed amendments. The No Action Alternative would not include any technical or editorial amendments to Comprehensive Plan text, goals, or policies included herein to meet GMA consistency requirements.

2.2.1 Staff Recommendation Summary

Staff recommendations for each proposed amendment (except Part B of MLA04-28) are explained under a heading for each individual proposal in part 2.3. The staff recommendations are presented to the Planning Commission for consideration. In transmitting the Planning Commission to the BOCC later this year, staff will have the opportunity to adjust these preliminary recommendations. The preliminary staff recommendations, including modifications and mitigation measures, are summarized in the following table:

2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket: Summary of Staff Recommendations for Suggested Amendments

#	APPLICATION NUMBER	APPLICANT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
1	MLA03-232	Port of Port Townsend	Jefferson County International Airport	Adopt with modifications as developed by County staff in coordination with Port staff.
2	MLA03-244	People for a Rural Quimper (Gabe Ornelas, Representative)	Jefferson County International Airport	Deny. Airport goals, policies and regulations are recommended through MLA03-232, as modified by staff.

#	APPLICATION NUMBER	APPLICANT	GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSAL	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
3	MLA04-27	Jefferson County	Consideration of parcels for Agricultural Lands designation on the map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations	Adopt pursuant to recommendation of Planning Commission Agricultural Lands Committee.
4	MLA04-28	Jefferson County	A. Plan and code amendments related to State-mandated 2004 GMA update B. Planning Commission five-year assessment	A. Adopt. B. Staff recommendation will be presented to Planning Commission during deliberation.

2.3 STAFF REPORTS: SUGGESTED AMENDMENTS

2.3.1 Proposals Involving the Jefferson County International Airport

There are two sets of amendment proposals that focus on the Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA or Airport). One, under file number MLA03-232, is suggested by the Port of Port Townsend, the public entity that owns and operates the JCIA. The other, under file number MLA03-244, is by a citizen group called People for a Rural Quimper (PRQ).

2.3.1.1 Reference Number: MLA03-232 (Port of Port Townsend – Airport)

Applicant: Port of Port Townsend

Location: The Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA) is located between State Route (SR) 19, SR 20, and Four Corners Road. The Airport is located approximately four miles southwest of the City of Port Townsend.

(Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code text amendments)

2.3.1.1.1 General Description and Environmental Information

The Port of Port Townsend (Port) has submitted suggested amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code (UDC). The proposal encompasses the following: (1) Proposes an Essential Public Facilities (EPF) district designation rather than an overlay for the Jefferson County Airport (JCIA); (2) proposes the establishment of an Airport Overlay based on a 55-DNL noise contour map projected through the year 2022 and adopted in 2004 with the Airport Master Plan (AMP); (3) proposes Comprehensive Plan and UDC changes related to the allowed and prohibited land uses within the Airport EPF and the Airport Overlay; (4) proposes a disclosure process by which prospective property owners and current owners who apply for certain land use approvals in the Airport Overlay would be informed about the close proximity to the JCIA and that the County does not consider noise impacts related to normal airport operations to be a public nuisance; and (5) proposes a future

planning process in which industrial uses would be considered in or adjacent to the Airport EPF in order to promote Airport self-sustainability.

The Port of Port Townsend has attempted to establish noise, disclosure and safety regulations for the JCIA for several years. Several iterations of overlays, zoning and uses have been brought forth by the Port of since the 1998 adoption of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. In December 2000, Jefferson County adopted the UDC, which created interim notice provisions related to Airport noise. The Port appealed the lack of Plan implementation to the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board (WWGMHB—Case No. 01-2-0016). However, before argument and a ruling, a settlement agreement was reached between the County and Port. The parties have subsequently worked collaboratively to address the issues raised in the appeal by developing revised Comprehensive Plan narrative, goal, and policy language, as well as proposed regulatory provisions that would be consistent with and implement the Plan language and the GMA.

The Regulatory Framework

The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), Chapter 36.70A RCW, includes specific requirements for regulating airports. The GMA recognizes the fact that certain types of facilities are both necessary to the region and likely to be resisted by neighboring property owners. The GMA includes provisions that protect such “essential public facilities” (EPFs) and limit what local regulations can impose or require. Furthermore, Washington courts have recognized that RCW 36.70A.200(5) and RCW 35.63.250 not only prevent a local jurisdiction from precluding the initial siting of an airport, but also prevent a local jurisdiction from precluding the expansion of or improvements to an already-existing airport.

2.3.1.1.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis

The following identifies the Department of Community Development (DCD) recommended line-in/line-out amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code (UDC). Inserted below are comments, analysis and recommendations.

Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code

On February 2, 2004, the Port of Port Townsend submitted for consideration proposed amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and UDC. Jefferson County staff reviewed the suggested amendments and collaboratively worked with the Port to refine the proposal. The suggestions by staff include formatting, text revisions, and substantive changes. The following highlights the proposed substantive changes which have been modified by staff in collaboration with the Port of Port Townsend:

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan

The following is a review of the Port proposal as submitted February 2, 2004 and the major modifications resulting from the on-going dialogue between the Port and Jefferson County.

- **Amend the proposed Airport Overlay language to exclude notification and comment by the Port of Port Townsend on certain development permits. The notification was revised to exclude all Type I (e.g., single-family dwelling) permits.**
- **Modify the implementing policies (EPP 2.1 2.5) to exclude sub-area planning as a mechanism to guide future uses and development within the Airport Essential Public Facility (AEPF) District.**

Staff Comment: Staff recommends excluding all Type I permits from the notification and review requirements. All Type II and III permits will be forwarded to the Port of Port Townsend in accordance with UDC section 8.2.4. For an explanation of permit types, refer to UDC Section 8.

The Jefferson County Unified Development Code

Delete sub-area planning references from Section 3.7.1.

Revise the proposed permitted and conditional uses allowed in the AEFDP District. The following uses have been deleted from the original proposal:

- Golf courses and driving ranges;
- Mineral extraction activities (without MRL overlay);
- Mineral processing accessory to extraction operations (with or without MRL overlay);
- Agriculture uses and activities;
- Aquatic plant and animal processing and storage;
- Government offices.

Staff Comment: The uses proposed under the newly established AEPF District have been modified to include uses which are predominately permitted or conditionally permitted in every zoning district. Additional uses may be considered through a planning process referenced in the proposed Plan policy.

Staff-initiated modifications to MLA03-232

The following review and analysis represents substantive changes and textual modifications to the original proposal submitted by the Port of Port Townsend. The original proposal has been modified by Jefferson County Staff in cooperation with the Port. These modifications represent a culmination of on-going discussion and dialogue with the Port. In fulfillment of the second settlement agreement, both parties have agreed to the changes included below. *Note: A version of the staff proposal without additional commentary appears among the Appendix Items.*

Proposed Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan

1) Two additional policies would be added under the heading entitled “GOALS & POLICIES,” on page 7-13 of the Economic Development Element, which would read as follows:

EDP 4.4 The County will actively support the efforts of the Port of Port Townsend to operate the Jefferson County International Airport as a self-supporting essential public facility. This may include, but is not limited to, the siting of appropriately scaled aviation and non-aviation-related industrial/manufacturing activities in the Airport Essential Public Facilities District, in accordance with the provisions of this Comprehensive Plan.

EDP 4.5 In accordance with County-wide Planning Policy 7.5, the legislative authority of the Port of Port Townsend is recognized as a valuable tool to implement industry and trade strategies and should be used to the fullest extent to promote employment opportunities to meet the needs of industry consistent with the goals and policies of this Comprehensive Plan.

Staff Comment: The insertion of EDP 4.4 and 4.5 would define the County’s commitment to recognize and support the Port as an essential public facility. Future actions taken by the Port to address the potential siting of non-aviation development will require undergoing an amendment process. This will include all of the provisions promulgated in Section 9 of the UDC.

2) A new section entitled “Jefferson County International Airport,” would be added following the section entitled “County-Wide Planning Policy” on page 9-3 of the Essential Public Facilities Element.

JEFFERSON COUNTY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT

Background

The Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA) is owned and operated by the Port of Port Townsend, a special purpose district governed by an elected Board of Commissioners. The Port is authorized under the laws of Washington State to promote, encourage and participate in economic development activities. The Port strongly desires to operate the airport as a self-supporting enterprise, a goal shared by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). The JCIA has been designated by Jefferson County as an essential public facility in accordance with the provisions of the Washington State Growth Management Act and this Plan. This designation is based on the recognition of the critical role that the airport plays in providing transportation services necessary to the general public welfare, and in supporting job generating economic development activities. The airport provides an invaluable alternative to surface routes for emergency medical transports and services, the shipment of goods and materials, and access by local residents, business travelers, and tourists. In addition, given the relatively isolated nature of the County, the airport is a valuable community resource during unplanned and planned road closures, such as periodic closures of the Hood Canal Floating Bridge for maintenance and repairs.

The operation of the JCIA is governed by provisions of the Growth Management Act (GMA) related to essential public facilities, and FAA Regulations that include measures to protect the public health and safety and guidance for encouraging compatible land uses. This is accomplished in part through the preparation of an airport master plan prepared in accordance with FAA guidelines. In 2002, the Port initiated a process to update its Airport Master Plan (AMP), which resulted in the adoption of the AMP by the Port Commissioners on December 22, 2003, and approval by the FAA on May 7, 2004.

Airport Overlay

It is important to recognize that the JCIA is an essential public facility. As with other modes of transportation, there is noise associated with its planned and lawful operations. This is common to all airport operations and the FAA has established standards to ensure that noise from airport operations is not incompatible, and does not unreasonably interfere, with the use and enjoyment of neighboring properties. Airport noise exposure is measured in a day-night average sound level (DNL) and is used to analyze and characterize multiple aircraft noise events, and for determining the cumulative exposure of such noise to individuals around airports. DNL means the 24-hour average sound level, in decibels, for the period from midnight to midnight, obtained after the addition of ten decibels to sound levels for periods between midnight and 7:00 a.m., and between 10:00 p.m. and midnight. The yearly day-night average sound level means the 365-day average, in decibels.

Fortunately, noise abatement measures at the JCIA have achieved compliance with FAA regulations regarding residential compatibility. In general terms, the 75 DNL is considered to be significant and may have severe impacts that would require further study and mitigation. The 65 DNL level delineates moderate noise exposure and is the threshold for residential compatibility. The 55 DNL level represents minimal noise impacts and is below the regulatory threshold of the FAA standards. The 50 DNL is a very conservative measure of noise impacts and is well below the accepted standard of 65 DNL. By way of comparison, 50 DNL is comparable to the noise from a residential lawn mower. It must be recognized, however, that noise abatement measures reduce, but do not eliminate all aircraft noise.

In 2002, using the most current and best available technologies, a revised noise analysis for current and projected operations at JCIA was conducted as a part of the airport master planning process. This analysis projects noise levels through 2022. Documented noise levels in excess of the established residential compatibility threshold of 65 DNL are limited to a very small area

located wholly upon Port owned property immediately surrounding the runways. However, DNL levels and noise and compatibility concerns are also considered a matter to be addressed at the local level. Individual and community responses to aircraft noise may differ, and for some individuals, even a moderate or low amount of noise may result in annoyance or irritation.

To address noise, safety and compatibility concerns, and to implement the directives of the Comprehensive Plan as adopted in 1998, the County has established an Airport Overlay. The Overlay boundary is a fixed boundary, reflecting the projected 55 DNL contour in the year 2022, as set forth in Exhibit 6.4 of the adopted Jefferson County AMP. The purposes of this Overlay are as follows:

- To disclose to permit applicants and prospective property owners their proximity to airport operations including take-off and landing patterns, and the potential for low level noise and vibrations associated with such activities; and
- To identify an airport safety zone within which certain uses will be prohibited for public safety and compatibility reasons (e.g., mobile home parks, churches, nursing homes, hospitals, day care facilities and other similar uses).

The Jefferson County Board of Commissioners finds that the Overlay has a rational basis because it is based upon best available technology and reflects those areas adjacent to the airport that are most affected by normal, routine airport operations (i.e., aircraft take-off and landing patterns). It is acknowledged that areas lying outside this fixed Overlay may also be subject to low level noise and vibration.

Staff Comment: The section will create language for the establishment of an Airport Overlay. In addition, the “Future Land Use Planning” has been amended to delete references for the utilization of a sub-area planning process for the AEPF.

Future Land Use Planning

The County's current Unified Development Code (UDC) generally limits uses within the Airport Essential Public Facilities District to aviation support facilities and aviation related manufacturing and light industrial uses. The County and Port acknowledge the need to consider permitting a broader range of uses within the district in order to maintain the long-term financial viability of this essential public facility. Accordingly, the County and Port will work together to prepare amendments to this Comprehensive Plan and the Jefferson County Unified Development Code (UDC) addressing Port owned property in the vicinity of JCIA, based on the Airport Master Plan. The Port will assume responsibility for preparing the proposed Plan and Code amendments (in coordination with County staff), and the County will docket the proposal during the applicable amendment cycle. The amendments will address the future use and development of property owned or acquired by the Port in the vicinity of the JCIA. The amendments will ensure the continuing operations of the JCIA as an essential public facility, in accordance with FAA regulations, the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act, this Comprehensive Plan, and the County-wide Planning Policies. The goal of these future amendments is to promote compatible land uses, provide employment opportunities, and facilitate the operations of the airport as a self-supporting enterprise in a manner consistent with the goals and requirements of the GMA. The amendments may take the form of expanded rural scale light industrial uses, or another form of amendment equally permissible under the GMA (e.g., major industrial development or land bank (RCW 36.70A.365 and RCW 36.70A.367), or urban growth area (RCW 36.70A.110).

As an essential public facility, the JCIA is also recognized for its important role in the economic health of the County. In accordance with the provisions of the GMA, cities and counties may not preclude the siting or the expansion of essential public facilities. The County-wide planning policies recognize that the Port's statutory authority is a useful tool to implement economic development and employment opportunities (CPP 7.5). Further, the Port desires to run the airport as a self-supporting facility so that it is not a burden upon the taxpayers of Jefferson County and

does not negatively impact other Port operations. The County recognizes and supports this goal. The Port has explored all opportunities to make the airport self-supporting, and yet it continues to operate at a deficit.

The long-term economic viability of the airport, as well as the economic development goals and policies contained in this Comprehensive Plan, support consideration of the expansion of the airport uses to include appropriately scaled non-aviation-related industrial development, provided that such uses are consistent with the GMA. The County recognizes that aviation-related industrial/manufacturing development is currently allowed on Port owned property at the Jefferson County International Airport.

If the amendments take the form of an expanded range of rural scale light industrial uses, such a change would not constitute a fundamental change in the purpose of the Airport Essential Public Facility (AEPF) Zone. Instead, such an amendment would merely remove a local limitation on the specific range of uses currently permitted within the zone. Such potential future revisions to the uses permitted within the AEPF zone would also be consistent with the requirement contained in earlier iterations of the Comprehensive Plan (i.e., 1998) that the County reconsider the use limitations during a subsequent planning process.

Staff Comment: Staff has recommended not utilizing the sub-area planning process as a land use planning mechanism. The impetus behind this recommendation is that current regulations for processing land use amendments will glean public participation, environmental review, public involvement, and appeal rights. The proposed changes outline a future land use planning effort to investigate rural-scale light industrial and/or the establishment of an industrial land bank adjacent to the AEPF. Future proposals will be subject to the amendment procedures which includes environmental review, public comment, and appeal.

3) Goal EPG 2.0 and policies EPP 2.1 and EPP 2.2 under the heading entitled “GOALS & POLICIES,” beginning on page 9-7 of the Essential Public Facilities Element, would be repealed and replaced with a new goal EPG 2.0 and new policies EPP 2.1 through 2.7 are proposed to be added.

GOAL:

EPG 2.0 — ~~Ensure the continued viability of the Jefferson County International Airport as a transportation hub.~~

POLICIES:

~~**EPP 2.1** — During the Port’s preparation of a sub-area plan for the JCIA and appropriate surrounding properties, limit new development proposals at the JCIA site to only those uses which are clearly identified as aviation support facilities or aviation related development in conformance with the airport’s designation as an essential public facility.~~

~~**EPP 2.1.1** — Aviation Support Facilities are those uses which directly support the operation of the Jefferson County Airport:~~

~~**EPP 2.1.2** — Aviation Related Development are those uses which are reliant upon the airport for their business:~~

~~**EPP 2.2** — Cooperate with the Port of Port Townsend to develop a sub-area plan to guide future development at the Jefferson County International Airport. This sub-area plan may evaluate non-aviation uses and activities that are compatible with the airport facility and surrounding area. The sub-area plan should address the~~

- ~~following siting issues for all new uses and activities proposed for siting at the Jefferson County International Airport and all plans for facilities expansion:~~
- ~~a. Compatibility with airport operations as an essential public facility;~~
 - ~~b. Provision of infrastructure consistent with the requirements of the GMA;~~
 - ~~c. Land use compatibility with surrounding area;~~
 - ~~d. Potential environmental impacts;~~
 - ~~e. Availability of alternative sites;~~
 - ~~f. Public health and safety;~~
 - ~~g. Sub-area plan amendment process for possible future acquisition of adjacent properties~~

GOAL:

EPG 2.0 Ensure continuing operation of the Jefferson County International Airport as a safe and self-supporting Essential Public Facility.

POLICIES:

EPP 2.1 The Jefferson County Unified Development Code will be reviewed and revised as appropriate to implement the approved JCIA Master Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Washington State Growth Management Act regarding the compatibility of land uses adjoining airports, and the status of the JCIA as a designated Essential Public Facility, and FAA regulations.

- A. Jefferson County will revise County Codes and procedures as appropriate, to promote future land uses and development activities in the vicinity of the airport that are compatible with land uses and activities in the AEPF District, in compliance with RCW 36.70.547.
- B. All land use and development activities will comply with FAA regulations including but not limited to electrical emissions, lighting, and height restrictions.
- C. Jefferson County will, in consultation with the Port of Port Townsend, identify and regulate land uses within the airport approach zone and regulate obstacles in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) 77.
- D. Land use or development activities that attract concentrations of birds or waterfowl in or near the designated Airport Overlay Zone will not be permitted.

EPP 2.2 Jefferson County will, in consultation with the Port of Port Townsend, discourage the siting of new, incompatible uses adjacent to the airport, provide disclosure of proximity to the airport to identified parcels, and address noise impacts, consistent with local concerns, FAA Regulations, State Department of Transportation Regulations, and the JCIA designation as an Essential Public Facility under the GMA.

- A. The County will, in consultation with the Port of Port Townsend, establish an Airport Overlay consistent with the Noise Contour Map which projects airport noise contours through the year 2022, as adopted by the Port of Port Townsend Board of Commissioners in the 2003 updated Master Plan, or as later amended. The County will formally adopt the noise contour map showing the 55 DNL as the Airport Overlay.
- B. The County will prepare and implement procedures for informing property owners within the Airport Overlay (55 DNL) of their proximity to the JCIA

and airport operations including aircraft takeoffs, landings, and overflights. Such procedures may include, but are not limited to, posting the Noise Contour Map on the County website; overlaying the 55 DNL Contour Line on the County's GIS system; inclusion of the Noise Contour Map in the County Map Index; and the preparation of informational letters and materials. The Map should contain a notation informing interested persons that the JCIA is an essential public facility and important use in the County, that properties in the vicinity may be subject to noise and vibration associated with normal airport operations, and that the County does not consider to be a nuisance any inconvenience or discomfort arising from such operations.

- C. The County will adopt regulations that provide notice and disclosure of airport impacts to property developers within the Airport Overlay (other than Type I permits (e.g. single family residential building permits)), and include a "no public nuisance" provision for normal airport operations.
- D. The County will encourage the Port of Port Townsend to continue its efforts to mitigate noise conflicts at Jefferson County International Airport.

EPP 2.3 In order to discourage the siting of incompatible land uses in the vicinity of the JCIA as required by the GMA, the County will review the uses permitted within the Airport Overlay and revise the UDC use table to prohibit or condition uses in the Airport Overlay that are incompatible as set forth in guidelines established by the Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division.

Staff Comment: The policies outlined in EPP 2.2 and 2.3 define the establishment of an Airport Overlay. The boundary would serve as a mechanism for notification and would include regulations prohibiting incompatible uses from being developed with the delineated boundary. In addition, notification procedures would be outlined to alert property owners within the boundary of their proximity to the airport and inconveniences which may occur due to normal operations of the JCIA.

Staff Analysis: The proposed Airport Overlay encompasses an elliptical boundary spanning over the JCIA and its periphery. The delineated boundary would incorporate several parcels in the vicinity not owned by the Port of Port Townsend. Staff has calculated that approximately 145 tax parcels are within the proposed boundary. This number may be slightly misleading due to: 1) the Port's ownership of approximately 55 parcels within the Overlay, and 2) the inclusion of a portion of the Irondale, Division 4 Subdivision. The lots located within the Irondale 4 plat are 5,000 square feet in size. Logistically, the siting of a residential structure with appropriate infrastructure would require combining several of the lots to meet minimum land area.

EPP 2.4 The next step after the recent adoption of the updated JCIA Master Plan is for the Port and County to work together to prepare amendments to this Comprehensive Plan and the Jefferson County Unified Development Code (UDC) addressing Port owned property in the vicinity of JCIA. In coordination with County staff, the Port will initiate the proposed amendments, which will be docketed by the County during the applicable Plan amendment cycle. The amendments, as may be modified through the public process, will be brought forth for final legislative action.

- A. The Airport Master Plan and subsequent Plan and Code amendments will provide for the safe operations of the JCIA and guide future development in accordance with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulations and the Airport's designation as an Essential Public Facility under the GMA.

- B. In preparing the Plan and Code amendments, the Port and the County will review and evaluate revisions to the County's Unified Development Code to consider permitting certain non-aviation-related industrial/ manufacturing uses that directly or indirectly support the JCIA. If allowed, such uses should be appropriately scaled, assure visual compatibility with the surrounding area, provide job opportunities for Jefferson County residents, be compatible with airport operations, and consistent with the requirements of the GMA.
- C. If certain non-aviation-related industrial/manufacturing uses are allowed, the County, in cooperation with the Port, may establish design standards to guide future development in the Airport Essential Public Facilities (AEPF) District, including, but not limited to: landscape buffers; visual screening; access requirements; and suitable bulk and dimension standards.
- D. In the event that the amendments take the form of expanded rural scale light industrial uses (i.e., as opposed to another form of amendment equally permissible under the GMA), the County, in cooperation with the Port, may establish rural level of service standards to ensure that the future development of property in the AEPF District does not result in sprawl.

EPP 2.5 Jefferson County will designate parcels owned by the Port of Port Townsend previously classified as being in the Airport Essential Public Facilities Overlay District as the JCIA AEPF District. This new District will supercede and replace the previous Airport Essential Public Facility Overlay District and will be incorporated into the County's Unified Development Code as a distinct District within the Public Lands Classification.

EPP 2.6 Property proposed by the Port, and identified in the FAA-approved Master Plan or future Comprehensive Plan amendment for inclusion in the AEPF District, will become part of the AEPF District, provided that:

- A. The proposed expansion of the AEPF boundaries is considered during the Comprehensive Amendment process as may be required by law; and
- B. Parcels eligible to be considered for inclusion within the AEPF District will be those properties within the airport layout plan (ALP) (which is part of, and incorporated within the FAA approved JCIA Master Plan), and/or bounded by State Route 19, State Route 20, and Four Corners Road, a designated County Arterial.

EPP 2.7 Jefferson County and the Port of Port Townsend will monitor state legislation and will evaluate the potential redesignation of the JCIA and surrounding properties as an Industrial Land Bank, Major Industrial Development, UGA, or related economic development land use category, in accordance with the provisions of Washington State Law.

Staff Comment: The inclusion of EPP 2.0, 2.1, 2.4, and 2.5 outlines a new goal and accompanying policies to recognize the Jefferson County Airport as an Essential Public Facility pursuant to RCW 36.70.547. In addition, the language expressed in this proposal implies a commitment to investigate future uses within the AEPF District. All future proposals to potentially modify the AEPF District will be subject to a formal amendment process including, notification, a formal comment period, SEPA review and appeal rights.

4) Goal EPG 3.0 and policies EPP 3.1 through EPP 3.10 under the heading entitled "GOALS & POLICIES," beginning on page 9-8 of the Essential Public Facilities Element, would be repealed in their entirety.

Staff Comment: The "Goals and Policies" outlined in this section are no longer applicable. Several of the policies have been adopted, are being proposed or have been included in other sections of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan.

5) The subsection entitled "JEFFERSON COUNTY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT STRATEGY" under the heading entitled "STRATEGIES," beginning on page 9-11 of the Essential Public Facilities Element, would be amended to read as follows:

B. JEFFERSON COUNTY INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT STRATEGY

Action Items

- ~~1. Jefferson County shall work cooperatively with the Port of Port Townsend and aviation officials to develop and adopt an "Airport Overlay Zone" for Jefferson County International Airport. (Corresponding Goal: 3.0)~~
- ~~2. Based upon the results of the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Study, the County may re-evaluate land use designations within the "Airport Overlay Zone." (Corresponding Goals: 2.0, 3.0)~~
1. The County will, in consultation with the Port of Port Townsend, establish an Airport Overlay based on the approved Noise Contour Map, with implementing regulations consistent with the provisions of this Comprehensive Plan, as amended, so as to help protect the current and future viability of the JCIA as an essential public facility.
2. The County will, in consultation with the Port, develop regulations which provide notice and disclosure of airport impacts to property developers within the Airport Overlay (other than Type I permits (e.g. single family residential building permits)), and include a "no public nuisance" provision for normal airport operations.
3. The County will establish a new Airport Essential Public Facility District as a distinct District within the Public Lands Classification, which will include all relevant regulations governing the development of the JCIA.
4. The County and the Port will continue to monitor federal and state legislation that may affect the development of Port owned property and may further amend the County's Comprehensive Plan and Development Regulations as appropriate.
5. During the future land use planning process for the JCIA, the County in consultation with the Port, will consider and evaluate potential revisions to the County's Unified Development Code which would permit non-aviation-related industrial, manufacturing and related activities on property within the Airport Essential Public Facility, and establish appropriate levels of service and design standards, including but not limited to setbacks, landscape buffers, visual screening, access requirements and rural bulk and dimensional standards.
6. The County will encourage the Port to continue its efforts to mitigate noise conflicts at the Jefferson County International Airport.
7. The County, in consultation with the Port of Port Townsend and the Washington State Department of Transportation Aviation Division, will review the UDC Table of Permitted

Uses and make revisions as appropriate to ensure the siting of compatible land uses within the Airport Overlay.

Staff Comment: The inclusion of new action items reiterates the intent for establishing an Airport Overlay. In addition, the aforementioned items promulgate investigating the feasibility of expanding uses with the designated AEPF District.

Proposed Amendments to the Unified Development Code

Revise UDC Table 1-1 of Section 1.4 to include the Airport Essential Public Facility District and Airport Overlay.

**Table 1-1 Comprehensive Plan
Land Use District Designations**

RF-40	Rural Forest
IF	Inholding Forest
Master Planned Resorts	
MPR	Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort
Public	
PPR	Parks, Preserves and Recreation
<u>AEPF</u>	<u>Airport Essential Public Facility</u>
Overlay Designations	
ESA	Environmentally Sensitive Areas
MRL	Mineral Resource Lands
WEPA-RR	West End Planning Area- Remote Rural
BRPA-RR	Brinnon Planning Area- Remote Rural
A	Airport Essential Public Facility
<u>AO</u>	<u>Airport Overlay</u>
SRT	Small-scale Recreation and Tourist

Staff Comment: The UDC Table 1-1 would be amended to include the newly established Airport Overlay District. The existing Airport Essential Public Facility District would be deleted and the newly created Airport Essential Public Facility District would be added under the “Public” land use classification.

The intent of the revised AEPF and Airport Overlay Districts would be the following:

Airport Overlay

1. Delineate a boundary based upon the 55-DNL noise contour mapping projected to the year 2022.
2. Create criteria to provide disclosure and notification to potential property owners and current owners undertaking defined development activity.

3. Utilize the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Aviation Manual to define and prohibit incompatible uses with the delineated Airport Overlay.
4. Provide a mechanism to refer land use and development applications to the Port of Port Townsend for appropriate review and comment.

AEPF District

1. Create a Euclidean zoning district which would supersede the current Airport Essential Public Facility Overlay.
2. Define additional uses which are permitted, or conditionally permitted within the AEPF District.

UDC Section 3.1, "Land Use Districts," subsection 5, would be amended to read as follows:

5. **Public.** This land use class consists of non-federal public lands used for special purposes. It includes ~~one main district~~ two districts:
 - a. **Parks, Preserves and Recreation (PPR).** This land use district consists of state and county parks, preserves and recreational sites. It is intended to provide for public recreational opportunities consistent with the rural character of the County and preserve significant natural amenities of special or unique character.
 - b. **County Waste Management Essential Public Facility**
 - c. **Airport Essential Public Facility (AEPF).** This land use district consists of land owned by the Port of Port Townsend that directly and indirectly supports the operations of the Jefferson County International Airport as an Essential Public Facility. It is intended to promote compatible land uses and the long-term economic viability of the JCI as consistent with County Goals regarding essential public facilities, the preservation of rural character, and economic development.

Staff Comment: Establishing the AEPF under Section 3.1.5 of the UDC would appropriately classify the JCI as an EPF. Currently, the Airport Essential Public Facility District is regulated as an overlay district. The proposed AEPF District will supersede the existing Airport Essential Public Facility Overlay which is comprised of 280 acres. The new AEPF District would encompass only parcels currently designated in the AEPF Overlay.

Regulations associated with the proposed Jefferson County International Airport Essential Public Facility (AEPF) District would be inserted into a newly created Section 3.3.6.

Staff Comment: Although the proposed Section 3.3.6 depicted here would be a new section, most of the language was drawn from the prior Section 3.6.11, which will be deleted and replaced with the Airport Overlay. Accordingly, the proposed language in this section has been presented in strikeouts and double-underlining to make clear which provisions of the former 3.6.11 are proposed to be retained, and which are proposed to be modified.

3.3.6 Jefferson County International Airport Essential Public Facility District (AEPF).

- a. **Purpose.** The purpose and intent of this section is to regulate land uses within the Airport Essential Public Facility ~~overlay~~ District (AEPF) in order to encourage orderly economic development in a manner compatible with airport operations and adjacent properties and to protect existing general aviation public use airports from conflicting or incompatible adjacent land uses or activities.
- b. **Designation.** ~~The overlay district (see Official Comprehensive Plan Map) applies to all Port of Port Townsend owned property within the Jefferson County International Airport~~

~~(JCIA). The JCIA aviation airport that provides recreational, business, flight training, charter and air taxi services and other uses. The Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA) is a general purpose, public aviation airport that provides recreational, business, flight training, charter and air taxi services and other uses. The Airport Essential Public Facility District designation (see Official Comprehensive Plan Map) shall apply to the following:~~

- ~~(1) All property designated as the Airport Essential Public Facility on the Official County Zoning Map;~~
- ~~(2) Any parcel or parcels that are subsequently acquired by the Port in accordance with the provisions of the approved JCIA Master Plan and approved through the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan text and land use amendment process, or any properly included in the Airport Essential Public Facility District through the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan text and land use map amendment process, or any other applicable process.~~

c. **Allowable Permitted, Conditional and Prohibited Uses.** All new development within the Jefferson County International Airport shall be restricted to uses which are clearly identified as aviation support facilities or aviation related development. New development within the AEPF District shall be restricted principally to Aviation Support Facilities and Aviation Related Manufacturing/Light Industrial Uses that directly or indirectly support its operation as an essential public facility in accordance with the provisions of the approved Airport Master Plan and the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, as amended. *Provided, however,* that certain public and quasi-public non-aviation related uses may be permitted as specifically set forth in this subsection (c); and *provided further* that the use restrictions set forth in this section shall be reviewed and re-evaluated, consistent with the directive of the *Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan (EPP 2.1)*, during a future land use planning process for the JCIA, to also consider allowing appropriately scaled non-aviation-related industrial/manufacturing uses.

(1) Permitted Uses:

- i. ~~Aviation Support Facilities. Aviation Support Facilities are those uses which~~ Aviation support facilities and activities that directly support flight operations and the operation of the Jefferson County International Airport, and include, but are not limited to: pilot and passenger service facilities including food service; charter services and aircraft rentals; airport-related government offices; navigational aids; runway aprons; terminal buildings; hangars; fuel storage facilities; operations/maintenance facilities; aviation museum and/or visitor interpretive center; automobile parking; and restaurants.
- ii. ~~Aviation Related Development: Aviation Related Development are those uses which are reliant upon the airport for their businesses, which include but are not necessarily limited to: Aviation related manufacturing and light industrial uses and activities that comply with FAA guidelines and which contribute to the operations of the JCIA as an economically self-supporting enterprise. These include, but are not limited to: aircraft repair facilities; aircraft remodeling facilities; aircraft sales and related aircraft equipment, services and supplies; aircraft manufacturing; airborne freight facilities; air pilot training schools; aviation clubs; taxi and bus terminal; automobile rental and associated parking; aviation related manufacturing authorized and approved by the Federal Aviation Administration; and aerial recreational activities (e.g., balloon rides, gliders, etc.).~~
- iii. Public works maintenance/ equipment storage shops;
- iv. Park and ride lots/transit facilities;
- v. Roads, public or private; and
- vi. Public trails and paths.

vii. Port-related government offices.

(2) Conditional, Discretionary and Special Uses (classified as "C," "C(a)," "C(d)" and "D" as described in the notes preceding Table 3-1, infra):

- i. Large scale regional transportation facilities (State-owned) (e.g., freeways) (C);
- ii. Unnamed Essential Public Facilities (C);
- iii. Emergency services (police, fire and EMS) (C);
- iv. Utility developments, major (C);
- v. Utility developments, minor (C(a));
- vi. Unnamed transportation uses (D);
- vii. Unnamed utility uses (D); and
- viii. Commercial communication facilities (note: this is a special use under section 4.13, infra.).

Staff Comment: The UDC currently defines and regulates uses within the AEPF Overlay. This proposal would repeal the AEPF Overlay and establish an AEPF District as a Euclidean zoning district. This newly created AEPF will serve as the regulating mechanism for uses within the Airport's EPF-designated parcels. In addition, a new Airport Overlay will be created to regulate incompatible uses and stipulate notification procedures for properties located outside of the AEPF District, but within the delineated Airport Overlay (55-DNL noise contour mapped area).

Section 3.3.6 outlines permitted and conditionally permitted uses being proposed for the newly created AEPF. Following is a comparative analysis of the proposed uses. A majority of those uses are currently allowed (either permitted or conditionally) in all zoning districts. Several of the proposed uses will be subject to the Type II or Type III permitting process. This process will review the proposed project for compliance with all applicable Federal, State and local codes and regulations. In addition, Type II and III permitting requires notification, comment and includes appeal rights.

PROPOSED PERMITTED USES	Existing Regulations	Staff Comment
Airport-related governmental offices	Currently allowed under Section 3.6.11.1(vii)	Aviation Support
Aviation museum/visitor interpretive center	New proposed use	Aviation Related
Restaurants	Airport currently contains a restaurant	Aviation Support
Aviation related manufacturing (authorized and approved by the FAA)	Currently allowed under Section 3.6.11.2.(iv)	Aviation Related; Expanded definition to include aviation related
Aerial recreational activities	New proposed use	Aviation Related
Public works maintenance/equipment storage shops	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts (as yes/c/c(d))except Parks, Preserve and Rec.
Park and Ride lots/transit facilities	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts (as yes/cd)
Roads, public or private; and	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts as a permitted "yes" use
Public trails and paths	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts as a permitted "yes" use
Port-related government offices	New proposed use	Allowed in other "Public" designated zone (Parks, Preserves and Recreation)

PROPOSED USES REQUIRING A CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT	Existing Regulations	Staff Comment
Large scale regional transportation facilities (State owned)	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts with Discretionary (D) review
Unnamed Essential Public Facilities (C);	New proposed use	Will require a Type III review and approval
Emergency services (police, fire and EMS) (C);	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts with Conditional Use review
Utility developments, major (C);	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts with Conditional Use review
Utility developments, minor (C(a))	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts with Conditional Use review
Unnamed transportation uses (D);	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts with Discretionary (D) review
Unnamed utility uses (D)	New proposed use	Allowed in all zoning districts with Discretionary (D) review
Commercial communication facilities	New proposed use	Subject to the Jefferson County Wireless Ordinance

(3) **Accessory Uses:** Other uses accessory or incidental to uses allowed in 3.3.6(c), above, are permitted in the Airport Essential Public Facility District subject to approval by the Federal Aviation Administration. Such uses include, but are not limited to caretaker residences.

(4) **Prohibited Uses:** ~~In order to determine whether or not a proposed use fits within the Airport Essential Public Facility overlay, the use must be specified. Uses not specified within this section are prohibited.~~ Additionally, uses or activities that may affect flight operations including, but not limited to the following, are expressly prohibited:

- i. Any use that releases airborne substances, such as steam, dust or smoke;
- ii. Any use that attracts concentrations of birds, waterfowl or other wildlife;
- iii. Uses that are determined to pose a hazard to the safe operation of the Airport as an aviation facility.

d. **Development Standards.** This section provides standards to minimize the conflicts between the Jefferson County International Airport and proposed future development proximal to the airport proper. ~~These protective standards prevent the establishment of~~ The following development standards are established to prevent future incompatible uses and airspace obstructions in airport clear zones, approaches and surrounding areas and shall comply with the standards established in the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Part 77 (Objects affecting navigable airspace). Where the standards contained in this section conflict with FAR, Part 77, the more restrictive shall apply. All other development standards and review and approval criteria in this Code shall also apply.

(1) **Electrical Emissions.** Any use or activity that emits electrical currents shall be installed in a manner that does not interfere with communication systems or navigational equipment.

(2) **Lighting.** New development that creates glare of lighting that interferes with the lights necessary for aircraft navigation, including landing and take-off, shall be prohibited.

(3) **Height Restrictions.** New development or alteration of existing development within the airport's navigable airspace shall be in accordance with "Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77: Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace."

(4) **Ground Transportation Facilities.** All uses shall be served by adequate transportation facilities, including appropriate facilities for transit, pedestrians, and bicycles. Where transportation facilities are not adequate to serve a proposed use, the applicant shall make provision for necessary improvements. Transportation facilities shall be deemed adequate if necessary improvements are planned and funded in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Six Year Transportation Improvement Program.

Transportation facilities shall meet the design standards of the Department of Public Works and Jefferson Transit. These standards include, but are not limited to, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual*, and the Washington Department of Transportation *Highway Design Manual* and *Standard Specifications for Road, Bridge, and Municipal Construction*.

~~(5) **Notice Provisions.** Land division, site plan applications, and building permits within the airport's area of influence (defined in the interim as that area within the airport's 65 DNL noise contour interval) shall be submitted to the Port of Port Townsend for comment. In addition, these applications shall contain or be accompanied by a notice provided by the administrator. Said notice shall include the following disclosure: "The subject property is near an airport where a variety of airport dependent uses occur that are not compatible with development. Potential discomforts or inconveniences may include, but are not limited to: noise, aircraft take-offs and landings." Such notice to be affixed to the plat and recorded with the Jefferson County Auditor.~~

~~(6) **Noise Provisions. [Reserved for Future Use].**~~

Staff Comment: Notification and noise provisions will be regulated under the newly created Airport Overlay District.

UDC Section 3.6.11, "Airport Essential Public Facility District (A)," would be deleted in its entirety and replaced with the Airport Overlay.

Staff Comments: Relocate and modify the Airport Essential Public Facility language from Section 3.6.11 to Section 3.3.6. Insert new provisions in Section 3.6.11 regarding the proposed Airport Overlay.

~~3.6.11 Airport Essential Public Facility District (A).~~

~~a. **Purpose.** The purpose and intent of this section is to regulate land uses within the "Airport Essential Public Facility" overlay district in order to encourage orderly economic development in a manner compatible with airport operations and adjacent properties and to protect existing general aviation public use airports from conflicting or incompatible adjacent land uses or activities.~~

~~b. **Designation.** The overlay district (see Official Comprehensive Plan Map) applies to all Port of Port Townsend owned property within the Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA). The JCIA is a general aviation airport that provides recreational, business, flight training, charter and air taxi services and other uses.~~

- ~~c. **Allowable and Prohibited Uses.** All new development within the Jefferson County International Airport shall be restricted to uses which are clearly identified as aviation support facilities or aviation related development.~~
- ~~(1) **Aviation Support Facilities.** Aviation Support Facilities are those uses which directly support flight operations and the operation of the Jefferson County Airport, and include, but are not limited to:~~
- ~~i. Passenger service terminals, including food service;~~
 - ~~ii. Navigational aids;~~
 - ~~iii. Runway aprons;~~
 - ~~iv. Terminal buildings;~~
 - ~~v. Hangars;~~
 - ~~vi. Fuel storage facilities;~~
 - ~~vii. Operations/maintenance facilities;~~
 - ~~viii. Automobile parking.~~
- ~~(2) **Aviation Related Development:** Aviation Related Development are those uses which are reliant upon the airport for their businesses, which include but are not necessarily limited to:~~
- ~~i. Aircraft repair facilities;~~
 - ~~ii. Aircraft remodeling facilities;~~
 - ~~iii. Aircraft sales and related aircraft equipment, services and supplies;~~
 - ~~iv. Aircraft manufacturing;~~
 - ~~v. Airborne freight facilities;~~
 - ~~vi. Air pilot training schools;~~
 - ~~vii. Aviation clubs;~~
 - ~~viii. Taxi and bus terminal;~~
 - ~~ix. Automobile rental and associated parking;~~
 - ~~x. Aircraft related manufacturing authorized and approved by the Federal Aviation Administration.~~
- ~~(3) **Accessory Uses:** Other uses accessory to uses allowed in 3.6.11(c), above, are permitted in the Airport Essential Public Facility Overlay District subject to approval by the Federal Aviation Administration.~~
- ~~(4) **Prohibited Uses:** In order to determine whether or not a proposed use fits within the Airport Essential Public Facility overlay, the use must be specified. Additionally, uses or activities that may affect flight operations including, but not limited to the following, are prohibited:~~
- ~~i. Any use that releases airborne substances, such as steam, dust or smoke;~~
 - ~~ii. Any use that attracts concentrations of birds, waterfowl or other wildlife;~~
 - ~~iii. Uses that are determined to pose a hazard to the safe operation of the Airport as an aviation facility.~~
- ~~d. **Development Standards.** This section provides standards to minimize the conflicts between the Jefferson County International Airport and proposed future development proximal to the airport proper. These protective standards prevent the establishment of future incompatible uses and airspace obstructions in airport clear zones, approaches and surrounding areas and shall comply with the standards established in the Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR), Part 77 (Objects affecting navigable airspace). Where the standards contained in this section conflict with FAR, Part 77, the more restrictive shall apply. All other development standards and review and approval criteria in this Code shall also apply.~~

- e. ~~**Electrical Emissions.** Any use or activity that emits electrical currents shall be installed in a manner that does not interfere with communication systems or navigational equipment.~~
- f. ~~**Lighting.** New development that creates glare of lighting that interferes with the lights necessary for aircraft navigation, including landing and take-off, shall be prohibited.~~
- g. ~~**Height Restrictions.** New development or alteration of existing development within the airport's navigable airspace shall be in accordance with "Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77: Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace."~~
- h. ~~**Ground Transportation Facilities.** All uses shall be served by adequate transportation facilities, including appropriate facilities for transit, pedestrians, and bicycles. Where transportation facilities are not adequate to serve a proposed use, the applicant shall make provision for necessary improvements. Transportation facilities shall be deemed adequate if necessary improvements are planned and funded in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Six Year Transportation Improvement Program. Transportation facilities shall meet the design standards of the Department of Public Works and Jefferson Transit. These standards include, but are not limited to, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) *Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets*, the Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual*, and the Washington Department of Transportation *Highway Design Manual and Standard Specifications for Road, Bridge, and Municipal Construction*.~~
- i. ~~**Notice Provisions.** Land division, site plan applications, and building permits within the airport's area of influence (defined in the interim as that area within the airport's 65 DNL noise contour interval) shall be submitted to the Port of Port Townsend for comment. In addition, these applications shall contain or be accompanied by a notice provided by the administrator. Said notice shall include the following disclosure: "The subject property is near an airport where a variety of airport dependent uses occur that are not compatible with development. Potential discomforts or inconveniences may include, but are not limited to: noise, aircraft take-offs and landings." Such notice to be affixed to the plat and recorded with the Jefferson County Auditor.~~
- j. ~~**Noise Provisions.** [Reserved for Future Use]~~

3.6.11 Jefferson County International Airport Overlay District (Airport Overlay)

- a. **Airport Overlay Designation.** The JCIA has been identified as an essential public facility in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plans of 1998 and 2004. The airport represents a highly valuable public asset. It provides both an important transportation service and a vital asset to facilitate economic growth in the county. As such, protection measures are needed to preserve the continued future viability of the airport. Therefore, an Airport Overlay is hereby created. For the purpose of this section, the Airport Overlay is that geographic area affected by the airport and defined on the basis of factors including, but not limited to, aircraft noise, aircraft flight patterns and airport safety areas. It is based on the Noise Contour Map contained in the FAA approved JCIA Master Plan, which projects the 55 DNL contour through the year 2022.
- b. **Purpose of Overlay.** The purpose of the Airport Overlay is to promote land uses that are compatible with ~~the impacts of aircraft using the JCIA and~~ normal airport operations within the airport environs. Because impacts of low flying aircraft can lead to pressure to curtail activities at airports, the Overlay is intended to protect the JCIA from such pressure, to apprise ~~put~~ new property owners and developers ~~on notice~~ of impacts from aircraft over-flights and the protect the public health, safety and general welfare. The

following regulations are intended to provide a general environmental disclosure to current and prospective property owners of their proximity to airport operations, including flight take-off and landing patterns, to promote compatible land uses, and to discourage the siting of incompatible uses. They are further intended to discourage the siting of incompatible uses adjacent to the airport, protect the airport as an essential public facility, and preserve the ability of the airport to continue its operations into the future.

c. Disclosure Provisions. Information regarding the Airport Overlay shall be provided as follows:

(1) Jefferson County shall, in consultation with the Port of Port Townsend, prepare and maintain an Airport Overlay Map and supporting informational materials that identify the parcels located within the Overlay. Such information shall also be made available to the public through the County website and the County Map database file, and be included as a layer in the County GIS. The information made publicly available shall include a general notation substantially stating as follows:

“JCIA is a community airport for civil aviation and has been designated an Essential Public Facility by Jefferson County in accordance with the provisions of the Washington State Growth Management Act and the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and, as such, is an important use in the County. Properties in the vicinity of the airport may be subject to potential discomforts or inconveniences from noise and vibration associated with aircraft takeoff, landing, over-flight, and normal ground operations at the JCIA site. The County does not consider to be a nuisance those inconveniences or discomforts arising from such operations, if such operations are consistent with Federal Aviation Administration regulations and standards. It is acknowledged that areas lying outside the fixed boundary of the Airport Overlay zone may also be subject to low level noise and vibration.” This information is intended only as a disclosure to property owners and potential property owners of their proximity to the JCIA, and the potential for low-level noise associated with airport activities.

(2) This section (2) applies to applications for all development EXCEPT Type I permits (e.g., single-family residences) as listed in UDC section 8.1.4, infra. It applies to all land division, site plan, conditional use, and all building permit applications, other than applications for Type I permits (e.g., single-family residential building permits), located within the Airport Overlay. Such applications shall contain, or be accompanied by the following disclosure: “The subject property is near a general aviation airport where a variety of airport dependent uses occur that may not be compatible with certain types of development. Potential discomforts or inconveniences may include, but are not limited to: noise, aircraft take-offs and landings and over-flight.”

(3) Project approvals, EXCEPT Type I permits (e.g., single-family residences) as listed in UDC section 8.1.4, whether permitted outright or conditionally, within the Airport Overlay shall contain as a condition of approval the following disclosure statement: “Jefferson County has determined that the Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA) is an essential public facility, and as such is an important use in the County. Both the Comprehensive Plan and the Growth Management Act require that the County discourage the siting of incompatible uses in the airport vicinity. The County will not consider to be a nuisance those inconveniences or discomforts arising from such operations, if such operations are consistent with accepted federal aviation regulations and standards, the Port’s noise abatement procedures and applicable local, state and federal laws. Since this real property lies within the Airport Overlay (a copy of which is available at the DCD Department and the POPT offices), you may be subject to

inconveniences or annoyances including, but not limited to, noise and vibration associated with aircraft takeoff, landing and over-flight, and noise and vibration due to normal ground operations at the JCIA site."

d. Comment by Port of Port Townsend. The Port of Port Townsend shall receive notice for all Type II and Type III projects that are located within the Airport Overlay. The County shall follow the referral and review requirements as listed in UDC section 8.2.4. The County, in its discretion, may also submit for comment development proposals located outside the Overlay, but in such proximity to JCIA that the County deems appropriate an opportunity to comment by the Port.

Staff Comment: The proposed Airport Overlay will encompass the following:

Acres within proposed Overlay - 386.8

Number of parcels within Overlay - 145

Port-owned parcels within the proposed Overlay - 55 (includes hangars, AEPF and other Port holdings).

Number of parcels not under Port ownership within proposed Overlay - 90

Acres within proposed Overlay currently designated EPF - 221.35

The adoption of the proposed Airport Overlay will create provisions for notifying property owners undertaking certain permitting activities (Type II and III). In addition, the ninety (90) identified parcels will be subject to the newly defined incompatible use provisions outlined in Table 3-1.

Staff revised the comment and notice to exclude Type I permits. This would allow DCD to process Type I permits (e.g., sheds, residences) without waiting for a formal comment period to expire. Staff has included a reference to Section 8.2.4, "Referral and Review of Development Permit Applications." The inclusion of Section 8.2.4 creates consistency with the process currently utilized to notify other agencies of the application and comment process. Disclosure language will be included in permits issued by the DCD. Applications for subdivisions within the Overlay will require affixing disclosure language on the plat, which is recorded by the Jefferson County Auditor. This process is currently required for proposals located within the 65-DNL noise contour mapping.

e. Nuisance Provisions. The following shall not be considered a nuisance: uses inherent to a general aviation public use airport, including but not limited to on and off-site aircraft noise and aircraft take-offs and landings, as well as airport maintenance, operation, construction and expansion activities, conducted in accordance with normal airport operation on land designated as Airport Essential Public Facility District (AEPF), regardless of past or future changes in the surrounding area land use or land use designations.

f. Uses Prohibited. The Washington State Department of Transportation, Aviation Division, recommends that certain uses be prohibited for safety and compatibility reasons. Such uses include mobile home parks, churches, nursing homes, hospitals, day care facilities, and other similar land uses. See Table 3-1 of this UDC for a list of prohibited uses within the Airport Overlay. Any parcel or portion(s) of parcels located within the Airport Overlay shall be subject to the UDC Table 3-1 provisions prohibiting incompatible uses. Any future changes to the underlying zoning or uses within the Airport Overlay shall be reviewed for incompatibility to the JCIA.

UDC Section 3.7.1, "Jefferson County International Airport Subarea Plan," which is currently reserved for future use, would be deleted.

3.7.1 Jefferson County International Airport Subarea Plan (Reserved – See Comprehensive Plan Policy EPP 2.2)

UDC Table 3-1, "Allowable and Prohibited Uses," would be amended to specify incompatible uses within the Airport Overlay.

Table 3-1: Allowable and Prohibited Uses

...
NOTES:

...
 5. Land Use Districts:

AG	Agricultural Resource Lands	I	Rural Industrial
AG-20	Commercial Agriculture	RI	Resource Industrial
AG-5	Local Agriculture	LI/C	Light Industrial/Commercial (Glen Cove)
F	Forest Resource Lands	LI	Light Industrial
		HI	Heavy Industrial
CF-80	Commercial Forest		
RF-40	Rural Forest		
IF	Inholding Forest		
RR	Rural Residential	P	Public
RR 1:5	Rural Residential – 1 DU/5 Acres	PPR	Parks, Preserves and Recreation
RR 1:10	Rural Residential – 1 DU/10 Acres	<u>AEP</u> <u>F</u>	<u>Airport Essential Public Facility (Refer to Section 3.3.6)</u>
RR 1:20	Rural Residential – 1 DU/20 Acres		
RC	Rural Commercial	UGA	Future Potential Urban Growth Area (Reserved)
RVC	Rural Village Center		
CC	Convenience Crossroad		
NC	Neighborhood/Visitor Crossroad		
GC	General Crossroad		

...
Staff Comment: The following are the proposed prohibited uses within the Airport Overlay. These uses have been deemed incompatible based upon the *Washington State Department of Transportation Airports and Compatible Land Use Manual, Vol. 1*.

Note: Table 3-1, as proposed for amendment, appears among the Appendix Items.

Incompatible Uses

1. Co-Housing/Intentional Communities
2. Manufactured/Mobile Home Parks
3. Multi-Family Residential Units
4. Residential Care Facilities w/6-20persons
5. Nursing/Convalescent/Assisted Living Facilities
6. Bed & Breakfast Inn (4-6 rooms)
7. Day Care, Commercial
8. Educational Facilities (State owned)
9. Assembly Facilities
10. Parks and Playfields
11. Recreational Facilities
12. School, Primary & Secondary
13. Religious Assembly Facility
14. Outdoor Commercial Amusement
15. Recreational, Cultural, or Religious Conference Center/Retreat Facilities

Staff Comment: The underlying zoning for parcels within the Overlay (excluding the AEPF) is entirely residential (RR1:5, RR1:10 and RR1:20). There are several incompatible uses not identified by the aforementioned list. Those uses (e.g., bulk fuel storage) are already prohibited in the underlying zoning. All future land use actions to potentially amend the underlying zoning would be reviewed to assure that incompatible uses are not established within the newly defined Airport Overlay.

UDC Section 7.1 "General Provisions," would include a newly created Section 7.1.6 to include disclosure language for Short Subdivisions, Long Subdivisions and Binding Site Plans located within the Airport Overlay.

Staff Comment: This is suggested to eliminate redundant language inserted into each section (long and short subdivision and binding site plan).

7.1.6 Compatibility with the Jefferson County International Airport

- a. Incompatible Uses.** If the proposed short subdivision, long subdivision or binding site plan is within the Airport Overlay, that it will not result in the siting of an incompatible use within the vicinity of the airport.
- b. Disclosure.** All short subdivision, long subdivision and binding site plans within the Airport Overlay shall record the disclosure statement required under Section 3.6.11 of this UDC. In addition, the statement shall be signed and affixed to the plat and recorded with the Jefferson County Auditor.

Staff Comment: The UDC currently contains provisions which require affixing disclosure language onto plats. However, this proposed requirement would apply to divisions within the 55-DNL noise contour map verses the previous requirement which required disclosure for divisions within the 65-DNL mapping.

UDC Section 8.8.5, "Approval Criteria for All Conditional Uses," would include the insertion of disclosure language as a condition for final Conditional Use Permit (CUP) approval.

- (8) The proposed conditional use will not result in the siting of an incompatible use adjacent to an airport or airfield within the Airport Overlay, as defined in Section 3.6.11 of this UDC. In addition, the disclosure language outlined in Section 3.6.11 shall be included as a condition of approval on all conditional use permits issued by Jefferson County.

2.3.1.1.3 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Pursuant to UDC section 9.8.1.b, the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall develop findings and conclusions that consider specific criteria. Those criteria, and staff evaluations, follow.

Whether circumstances related to the proposed amendment substantially changed since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan

Since adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, Jefferson County has:

- Entered into a settlement agreement with the Port of Port Townsend for provision of implementation measures for noise provisions related to Airport noise and an airport overlay
- Adopted the Updated Airport Master Plan (AMP).

The proposal includes Comprehensive Plan amendments to guide the incorporation of the AMP into the Comprehensive Plan and reaffirms the intent to incorporate the AMP into the Comprehensive Plan as a subarea plan according to existing goals and policies, along with UDC amendments to provide a means for

implementing the AMP. In addition, GMA provisions for essential public facilities, along with accompanying FAA regulations, have resulted in the designation of the JCIA as an Essential Public Facility under the Public Lands Classification of the UDC.

Whether the assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid, or whether new information is available

The assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based, in relation to the JCIA, remain valid. The proposed amendments are the first step in following the goals and policies for establishing the JCIA as a specified area for planning purposes. In addition, new information is available in association with the AMP that allows Jefferson County to establish allowable land uses in the proposed airport overlay area.

Whether the proposed amendment reflects current widely held values

This consideration will become evident through public hearing and testimony before the Planning Commission.

Following is environmental analysis presented in the format of the Non-Project Action Supplemental Sheet to the Environmental Checklist developed by the Department of Ecology pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Discussion of each change according to questions set forth in SEPA Rules:

Section D. Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions

Question #1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

- No significant increase in discharge to water is projected. The proposed amendment could result in added impervious surfaces as aviation-related uses are constructed, resulting in increased stormwater flows and possible degradation of water quality. Storm water run-off associated with the subsequent construction of project specific development proposals will be addressed in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local standards.
- No direct impacts to air quality would result from the proposed amendments. Emissions to air as a result of forecasted growth in aviation activity is below FAA thresholds.
- Storage of and access to aviation fuels will be subject to FAA regulations. Additional aviation fuel storage may be provided at the airport in accordance with FAA standards. The proposed amendments would not permit any new land uses at the JCIA that are not currently permitted, and thus would not pose any environmental health hazards, which were not previously anticipated by the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.
- While not increasing production of noise, one primary objective of the proposal is to apprise property owners in the vicinity of the JCIA/EPF of noise and vibrations associated with normal, routine airport operations conducted in accordance with FAA requirements. The policy and code revisions establish an Airport Overlay based on the 55 DNL Contour Line projected for the year 2022 as identified in the approved JCIA Noise Contour Map. A 65 DNL level delineates moderate noise exposure and is the threshold for residential compatibility. The projected 65 DNL contour only included Port-owned property and as a result, the establishment of the Overlay based on the projected 55DNL is being undertaken to implement the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, and to further ensure that existing and prospective property owners are aware of their proximity to the airport and the status of the JCIA as an

Essential Public Facility. The proposed UDC amendments would also limit land uses in the Overlay Zone in accordance with WSDOT Aviation Division Guidelines.

Question #2 How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

The proposal would not affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life. Project-specific development that may occur as a result of the proposal would be subject to applicable federal, state, and local protections for plants, animals, fish, and marine life.

Question #3 How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

All subsequent project specific development proposals will be subject to applicable federal, state, and local energy conservation standards.

Question #4 How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands.

The majority of the amendment site is not impacted by critical areas. Wetlands occur within the JCIA/EPF designated areas, and were delineated and avoided in formulating the Updated Airport Master Plan. Environmentally sensitive areas have been identified on master plan maps and will be avoided when subsequent project specific development proposals are designed and constructed. It is possible that future development may include impact to less than 0.1 acres of wetlands. No other environmentally sensitive areas occur within the AMP boundaries.

Question #5 How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

The current designation and zoning is an overlay with no specified underlying land use zone; the proposal would create a zoning district and a separate overlay zone based upon noise contours. The use designation change would effectively limit land uses in certain areas located in proximity to the airport based upon noise receiving levels. None of the proposed amendments would eliminate housing, except to the extent that certain higher density housing forms would not be permitted, in future, within the limits of the Airport Overlay District for safety and compatibility reasons.

The proposed Plan and UDC amendments are intended to be consistent with airport-related directives of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. The proposed policies are intended to guide future County/Port actions that include promotion of safe airport operations and determining land uses compatible with airport operations. Policy amendments would not allow or encourage incompatible land uses, and are intended to reduce safety and noise incompatibilities.

No portion of the JCIA lies within the shoreline jurisdiction.

Question #6 How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Additional aviation-related uses could also increase traffic to and from the airport, resulting in increases in traffic congestion. Traffic associated with the subsequent construction of project specific development proposals will be addressed in future review processes.

The proposed Updated Airport Master Plan was prepared to address the forecasted increase in operations at the airport, a designated Essential Public Facility under the GMA. The proposed amendments are intended to promote the ongoing and long-term viability of the JCIA, and allow routine airport operations to continue, consistent with the FAA approved Airport Master Plan.

Question #7 Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan and UDC amendments are consistent with FAA regulations, the provisions of the GMA, and the directives of the 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan.

2.3.1.1.4 Staff Recommendation

The aforementioned findings, review and analysis includes the changes made by staff to the Port of Port Townsend's proposal, as submitted February 2, 2004. Staff recommends the adoption of MLA03-232 with the modifications outlined above.

2.3.1.2 Reference Number: MLA03-244 (People for a Rural Quimper – Airport)

Applicant: People for a Rural Quimper (Gabe Ornelas, Representative)

Assessor Parcel Number(s): N/A

Location: Jefferson County International Airport (Comprehensive Plan text amendment)

2.3.1.2.1 General Description and Environmental Information

The citizen group People for a Rural Quimper (PRQ) has suggested amendments to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. Their proposal is comprised of the following: 1) delete all references in the Comprehensive Plan for the establishment of a noise overlay; 2) utilize the sub-area planning process as a mechanism to guide future growth and development within the Airport Essential Public Facility Overlay; and 3) delete references in the Comprehensive Plan regarding discouraging incompatible uses adjacent to the airport. The proposal would amend the text of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan by deleting references to establish an Airport noise overlay.

2.3.1.2.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Pursuant to UDC section 9.8.1.b, the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall develop findings and conclusions which consider specific criteria.

Whether circumstances related to the proposed amendment substantially changed since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan

The circumstances have changed since the adoption of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan includes language for establishing a Noise Overlay Zone around the Jefferson County International Airport (JCIA). In addition, the Comprehensive Plan outlines action items to re-evaluate land use designations within the newly created Airport Overlay Zone.

Staff Comment: Jefferson County is concurrently reviewing two separate proposals to amend language pertaining to the Airport and surrounding parcels. The two submitted proposals are dichotomous, which suggests that recommending approval of one proposal would in essence be recommending denial of the other. Staff is recommending the creation of an Airport Overlay, which would delineate a boundary around the Airport and its periphery. The boundary will serve as a mechanism to trigger notification for

property owners undertaking land use and development activity. In addition, new regulations consistent with RCW 36.70A.510, 36.70.547 and Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) guidelines are being proposed that prohibit incompatible uses within the Airport Overlay (i.e., for safety and compatibility reasons).

Whether the assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid, or whether new information is available

The assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid. On May 7, 2004, the Airport Master Plan for the Jefferson County Airport was adopted by the Federal Aviation Administration. In addition, the “Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study” has been completed, which outlines new boundaries and regulations for land uses and development.

Staff Comment: There are several policies and provisions outlined in the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan which required further analysis, review and study prior to taking action. Several of these items have been completed and now warrant revisions to the ordinances and codes. The Comprehensive Plan outlines policy to create an Airport Overlay Zone which would discourage incompatible uses adjacent to the Airport. Staff is recommending adoption of an overlay and corresponding regulations which prohibit the siting of incompatible uses in accordance with WSDOT aviation guidelines.

Whether the proposed amendment reflects current widely held values

The proposal would delete policies to create an “Airport Overlay Zone.” The proposed amendment encourages the creation and adoption of a sub-area and airport master plan.

Staff Comment: Staff is recommending adoption of a modified version of the Port’s suggested amendments, which would create an “Airport Overlay.” Staff recommends the establishment of an Overlay to assure regulations comply with RCW 36.70A.510 and 36.70.547.

Implementation Requirements

Approval of the proposed amendment would not require a change to the Jefferson County Land Use Map. The proposed amendments are text only and would not affect the land use map.

2.3.1.2.3 Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends denial of the suggested amendments (MLA03-00244) to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan. Staff has recommended approval of a modified version of the Port of Port Townsend’s proposal (MLA03-232), which delineates an “Airport Overlay.”

Jefferson County has reviewed two separate proposals to amend language pertaining to the Airport and its environs. The two submitted proposals are dichotomous, which suggests that recommending approval of one proposal would in essence be recommending denial of the other. Staff is recommending the creation of an “Airport Overlay,” which would delineate a boundary around the airport and its periphery. The boundary will serve as a mechanism to trigger notification for property owners undertaking land use and development activity. Denial of the aforementioned proposal (MLA03-244) and adoption of MLA03-00232 will create policies consistent with RCW 36.70A.510, 36.70.547 and the WSDOT guidelines for regulating incompatible uses adjacent to airports.

2.3.2 Proposals Initiated by Jefferson County

There are two items on the Docket that are initiated by Jefferson County. The first item, under file number MLA04-27, involves consideration of a list of parcels of real property for designation as Agricultural Lands of Long-Term Commercial Significance on the map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations.

The other item, under file number MLA04-28, involves two parts, the first being a County staff response to update requirements pursuant to the State Growth Management Act (GMA) and the second being a public review amendment proposal from the Planning Commission pursuant to that body's five-year assessment of the Comprehensive Plan. The five-year assessment process is described in Section 9.5.4 of the Unified Development Code (UDC). Section 9 of the UDC proscribes the amendment process for both the Comprehensive Plan and the GMA Implementing Regulations (a.k.a., the UDC itself).

2.3.2.1 Reference Number: MLA04-27 (Jefferson County – Agricultural Lands)

Applicant: Jefferson County

Assessor Parcel Number(s): Refer to Appendix Item – list of parcels

Location: Various. Refer to Appendix Item – list of parcels

2.3.2.1.1 General Description and Environmental Information

The proposal constitutes the penultimate step in Jefferson County's Agricultural Lands planning effort that was initiated in 2002 and is expected to be completed in 2006. The current effort would result in a Comprehensive Plan amendment to potentially change the land use designation of some parcels to Agricultural Lands on the official map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations. The purpose of the Agricultural Lands planning effort is to complete unfinished tasks outlined in the Natural Resource Conservation Element of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. *Note: The Natural Resource Conservation Element is not included in the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update [MLA 04-28].*

In preparation for the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment, the UDC was amended to clarify the exemption from standard stream and wetland buffers for existing and ongoing agriculture (MLA02-485), the Comprehensive Plan was amended to simplify Agricultural Lands designations and adjust associated policy language (MLA03-209), and the UDC was further amended to establish regulations for Agricultural Activities and Accessory Uses within designated Agricultural Lands (MLA04-26). The work that remains after the current planning effort is completed would be ongoing basin-by-basin planning to establish basin- or site-specific agricultural best management practices (BMPs) to protect water quality and fish and wildlife habitat.

DCD and WSU Extension hosted an Ag Lands Open House on June 23, 2004 to educate landowners on the Agricultural Lands planning process and describe the opportunity for landowners to apply for Agricultural Lands zoning, with final zone changes to occur during the 2004 Comprehensive Plan amendment cycle. The applications for parcel zone change to Agricultural Land of Local Importance were reviewed by the Agricultural Lands Committee of the Jefferson County Planning Commission based on Table 4-2A, summary of Agricultural Land Designations of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, and the following criteria:

- Current or intended utilization for long-term commercial use will be determined by the owner's statement on his re-designation request form indicating that he is selling his agricultural product or adding value to the product and then selling it.
- There will be no minimum parcel size for land eligible for re-designation to agriculture, however, parcels that are five acres or smaller that are adjacent to a cluster of parcels one acre or smaller will not be eligible unless they are also adjacent to land designated as agriculture or land designated as Rural, Commercial or Inholding Forest.

- Parcels designated Rural Forest 1:40 which are under 40 acres in size are eligible for re-designation to agriculture and parcels that are 40 acres or larger in size are not eligible for re-designation to agriculture. (This is because the re-designation to Agriculture with its minimum lot size of 20 acres should not be a means of granting greater residential density on any parcel.)
- For the purposes of determining Agricultural Lands zoning, Christmas tree farming and silviculture (the cultivation of trees of the local region or forest) do not constitute commercial agriculture. These practices fall under the rules governing forestry.
- Parcels next to small parcels or lots that have similar or large parcels on three sides can be approved, particularly if they are separated by a road from the smaller parcels. See also Appendix Item.

The parcel review resulted in the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment for re-designation of a total of 253 parcels representing approximately 3,900 acres. The parcels would be re-designated from their existing land use designation to the Agricultural Land of Local Importance designation. The existing designations include Rural Residential (RR) 1:5, RR 1:10, RR 1:20, and Rural Forest if the parcel size is less than 40 acres.

The parcels proposed for re-designation are listed and mapped in the Appendices. Most of the parcels listed are currently utilized for commercial agricultural purposes. A small number of parcels are not yet in commercial production; however, the owners have stated that they intend to begin commercial agriculture in the near future. Most of the current and proposed commercial agricultural uses are low intensity operations used as supplementary income for the property owner. Many properties are used for growing hay and raising cattle.

In Jefferson County, current zoning allows agricultural practices, including raising livestock or crops for commercial purposes on all zones. There are no zoning restrictions on the type or number of livestock that can be raised on a parcel. The change in zone designation to Agricultural Land of Local Importance does not, therefore, result in a change to the basic right to raise livestock or crops. It will, however, result in a change in the type and range of commercial agricultural activities that can be practiced on the parcels and on the type of county permits required for various agriculturally related activities. The details of the range of activities permitted with agricultural zoning and the types of permits required are contained in Section 3 of the Unified Development Code.

2.3.2.1.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Pursuant to UDC Section 9.8.1.b, the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall develop findings and conclusions that consider specific criteria. Those criteria, and staff evaluations, are as follows:

Whether circumstances related to the proposed amendment substantially changed since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan included policies and action items related to completing Agricultural Lands planning, including the establishment of an “Agricultural Lands of Local Significance” program and development regulations specific to land designated as Agricultural Lands. These proposed amendments are intended to be a step toward fulfilling policies and action items in the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Whether the assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid, or whether new information is available

Refer to response above.

Whether the proposed amendment reflects current widely held values

This consideration will become evident through public hearing and testimony before the Planning Commission.

Following is environmental analysis presented in the format of the Non-Project Action Supplemental Sheet to the Environmental Checklist developed by the Department of Ecology pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Discussion of each change according to questions set forth in SEPA Rules:

Section D. Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions

Question #1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Answer #1. Agricultural Lands are identified as natural resource lands in the GMA, the Comprehensive Plan, and the UDC. The proposed amendment would have the effect of providing for increased preservation of agricultural lands in the County. The parcels proposed for re-designation as Agricultural Land of Local Importance are largely in agricultural use. For purposes of this analysis, the maximum impact of the proposed re-designations, considered as a group, is based on the assumption that some properties will continue in current agricultural uses and that some parcels will develop intensively. The most intensive type of agriculture development is projected to be a use that combined maximum cultivation of plants or livestock plus processing the agricultural product on the farm and retail sales from the farm including aspects of agritourism such as special events, festivals and other crowd generating activities. Examples of this intensive type of agriculture are raising wine grapes, processing them into wine and holding wine tasting events, or processing cheese from livestock on the farm and selling it in a retail store on the farm.

The proposed amendment would not lead to a change in use that increase impacts to water, air, or noise. Release of toxic or hazardous substances are an inherent danger in any commercial activity, including commercial agriculture. Given the existing physical land uses, however, it is unlikely that an increase in release of toxic or hazardous substances would be realized. In addition, because the parcels proposed for re-designation are scattered widely throughout the county and range in size from approximately 1 acre to 100 acres and average about 15 acres each, the impacts will be widely dispersed.

Question #2 How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Answer #2. For the same reasons stated in answer #1, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will not have any significant affect on plants, animals, fish or marine life. In addition, to the extent that agricultural uses are less intensive than other development possibilities with existing zoning, the amendment would serve to better protect plants, animals, fish, and marine life.

Question #3 How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Answer # 3. The proposal for re-designation of approximately 3,900 acres of land to Agricultural Land of Local Importance, by its adopted GMA-based definition, is a resource-producing designation. For the same reasons stated in answer #1, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments would not be likely to deplete energy or natural resources.

Question #4 How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands.

Answer #4. For the same reasons stated in answer #1, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will not be likely to use of affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands.

Question #5 How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Answer #5. For the same reasons stated in answer #1, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not likely to affect land and shoreline use, including allowing or encouraging land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans. In the Rural Residential zones various types of activities comparable to some of the activities permitted on agricultural land are also allowed, subject to permit. These include home businesses, cottage industries, bed and breakfast establishments, and other types of tourist and recreation facilities and events. Therefore the conversion of Rural Residential land to Agricultural Land of Local Importance should not have an impact appreciably different from the existing potential impact of activities on residential land.

Question #6 How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Answer #6. For the same reasons stated in answer #1, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities. The Jefferson County Public Works Department has determined that the proposal would not generate significant traffic volumes as to diminish the adequacy of the County road network in the rural area surrounding the properties proposed for re-designation (see Appendices).

Question #7 Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

Answer #7. For the same reasons stated in answer #1, the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments are not likely to conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment. Whether Plan objectives are being met as specified or remain valid and desirable. The proposed amendment would meet the goals and objectives of the GMA and would contribute to Jefferson County's commitment to greater agricultural preservation. The proposed amendment does not invalidate other objectives related to either the County's resource land planning agenda or the Comprehensive Plan.

Implementation Requirements

Approval of the proposed amendment would require amendment of the official map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations. Parcels approved for Agricultural Lands designation would be so designated on the land use map and added to Jefferson County's base of Resource Lands under the GMA.

2.3.2.1.3 Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends adoption of the proposed amendments, as recommended by the Planning Commission Agricultural Lands Committee, to the official map of Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations.

2.3.2.2 Reference Number: MLA04-28 (Jefferson County – Comprehensive Plan Update/Assessment)

Applicant: Jefferson County (Staff for Part A and Planning Commission for Part B)

Assessor Parcel Number(s): N/A

Location: N/A (countywide)

2.3.2.2.1 General Description and Environmental Information

Jefferson County opted in to the Growth Management Act (GMA) in 1991 in the face of rapid growth. Jefferson County's high growth rate in the early 1990's would have required participation with GMA. The Comprehensive Plan was adopted by the BOCC in 1998. The GMA (RCW 36.70A.130.4(a)) requires that Jefferson County update its Comprehensive Plan for consistency with GMA before December 1, 2004 and every seven years thereafter.

There are two components to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update. The first is Jefferson County staff's response to Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements under RCW 36.70A.130 to periodically review and update the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations. The staff's Plan update includes the Elements of Utilities, Transportation, and Capital Facilities. The second Plan Update component is the Jefferson County Planning Commission's five-year assessment as required by Section 9, subsection 9.5.4, of the Unified Development Code (UDC). The Planning Commission's assessment includes revisions to the Comprehensive Plan Introduction and Elements of Land Use and Rural, Housing, Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation, Economic Development, and Environment.

Jefferson County has been continually updating and revising the Comprehensive Plan and associated development regulations since 1998 to respond to new GMA legislation and case law; this is the first instance, however, in which the Plan is proposed to be thoroughly updated to reflect current County conditions. The principal areas for consideration under the statutory update are population allocation, capital facilities planning, and best available science as applied to the regulatory protection of critical areas. The most recent population projections from the Office of Financial Management (OFM) and allocations that have been adopted by the BOCC have been used in capital facilities planning.

Jefferson County has adopted amendments to its Comprehensive Plan and Unified Development Code to protect Environmentally Sensitive Areas such as Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, wildlife habitat, and Seawater Intrusion Protection Zones using Best Available Science. Jefferson County has studied Channel Migration Zones (CMZ) to better protect the safety of people living near floodplains and to protect the ecological function Frequently Flooded Areas. Along with the Staff's presentation of updated Comprehensive Plan Elements, Staff is conducting a review of the UDC Land Use Districts (UDC 3.6.4 through 3.6.10) that apply to Critical Areas (wetlands, geologically hazardous areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, and fish and wildlife habitat areas). The purpose of the review is to determine whether to update existing UDC-based concepts of and requirements for "best available science" (BAS) as required by the GMA. Jefferson County considered BAS during the review and adoption process for the UDC in 2000.

The Planning Commission component of the proposal also includes a site-specific re-zone of an approximate 18-acre site from Rural Residential 1:10 (RR 1:10) to reverse a Comprehensive Plan-related property downzone.

2.3.2.2.1.1 *MLA04-28A*

Comprehensive Plan Update Completed By Staff

MLA04-28A includes the seven-year (7-year) update of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan in accordance with the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), RCW Chapter 36.70A. The GMA requires regular review and update of comprehensive plans. The comprehensive plans and development regulations of counties and cities that plan under the GMA are to be reviewed and revised, if necessary, at regular intervals to ensure that the plan and regulations still comply. Any changes that are made to a comprehensive plan during the review process must be consistent with the GMA, including any amendments that have been made since the adoption of the comprehensive plan.

The proposed update was completed by the Jefferson County Planning staff to revise and refine the 1998 Comprehensive Plan policy direction, rather than markedly depart from the original Plan vision. The primary features of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update completed by Staff include updated growth targets, text and policy amendments, and level of service updates for the transportation system and capital facilities Elements. Text revisions and policy amendments are included in the Update as needed to accommodate population projections and level of service changes, and to provide Plan Element consistency.

Updated Growth Target

The primary change in growth targets for planning for the County’s future includes the extension of the County’s GMA planning horizon from 2016 to 2024 as required by the GMA and by Jefferson County Countywide Planning Policies. The 7-Year Update of the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan is required by GMA to accommodate the forecasted population in the County through 2024. The County's growth targets result from an update of population projections from the State Office of Financial Management (OFM) specifically for GMA planning. The following table includes the OFM and County calculated population projections for all years through Jefferson County’s new planning horizon of 2024.

Jefferson County Annual Population Projections 2005-2024		
Year	Population Projection	Population Increase
2005	28,308	
2006	28,815	507
2007	29,327	512
2008	29,844	517
2009	30,366	522
2010	30,892	526
2011	31,527	635
2012	32,142	615
2013	32,771	629
2014	33,413	642
2015	34,067	654
2016	34,748	681
2017	35,426	678
2018	36,108	682
2019	36,794	686
2020	37,483	689
2021	38,145	662
2022	38,809	664
2023	39,473	664
2024	40,139	666

Based on Washington State Office of Financial Management Projection for 2005 and 2010-2024

As shown in the table, the planning horizon increase would be 666, resulting in a County population of 40,139. In adopting its 7-Year Comprehensive Plan Update, the County must demonstrate that this population level can be accommodated within the county in terms of housing, services, and infrastructure. Jefferson County determined in its Comprehensive Plan update process that there is sufficient vacant land, based on a land capacity analysis to accommodate the projected population within the County.

Level of Service Update

Revisions and updates of the Transportation and Capital Facilities elements were completed to describe the County’s transportation system and capital facilities in terms of adopted level of service standards and issues related to the Irondale-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA), GMA concurrency, and the County transportation network without changing methodology or policy direction of the 1998 plan.

Existing growth in Jefferson County is guided by the combination of the goals and policies contained in the existing 1998, as amended, and as implemented through the UDC. The following is a discussion of the purpose of each Comprehensive Plan Element, along with a summary of major policy changes that accompany the Update. The line-in/line-out sections of the Comprehensive Plan are attached as Appendix Items. The following is a summary of substantive changes that have been made within each Plan section.

Chapter 10—Transportation

The GMA provides a framework for addressing land use and transportation linkages and provides a mechanism for growth that will maintain the quality of life in the community. The GMA requires that level of service analyses of state-owned transportation facilities within the transportation element of a comprehensive plan. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element provides a framework for decision-makers to coordinate the transportation and land use elements through provision of a strategy for addressing issues, such as economic development, urban traffic congestion, safety, the movement of goods, and access to tourist sites.

The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Transportation Element has been updated to reflect the 2024 planning horizon and revised to acknowledge the Irondale-Port Hadlock UGA, adopted LOS standards, and GMA concurrency. The 2004 Plan Update includes updated roadway functional classification and accident data, as well as transit route and ridership numbers, air, waterborne & freight travel data, and nonmotorized transportation data. The text has been revised to describe roadway deficiencies derived from the Road Project Priority Programming System and includes an update of the minimum LOS policy for public transportation.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Revisions As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
Highways and Arterials	
TRP 1.3: Policy re-written without changing policy intent.	TRP 1.10: Enhance urban qualities by applying appropriate urban standards in Urban Growth Areas and Master Planned Resorts. TRP 1.11: Design roadways in the County Road system according to their functional classification and forecasted 20-year traffic demand.
Public Transportation	
TRP 2.3: Revision within policy for LOS of Annual Transit Revenue Service Hours from 472 ATRSH per 1,000 county-wide population to 270 ATRSH per 1,000 county-wide population.	
Land Development Standards	
TRP 4.6: Issue list item added for subdivision and commercial project design requirements: i. Frontage improvements and roadway features to meet urban design standards within the Irondale-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area and, when appropriate, the Port	TRP 4.10: Ensure that new developments that would generate traffic that would significantly decrease the Level of Service below the adopted Level of Service Standard for an intersection or roadway segment not be approved without stipulations for mitigation. When a

<p>Ludlow Master Planned Resort.</p>	<p>new development would lower the Level of Service below the adopted Level of Service Standard, require the development proponent to mitigate the impact by one of the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Construct improvements that restore the Level of Service to the adopted Level of Service Standard; 2. Contribute an impact fee that is a proportionate share of the cost of improvements related to the development; 3. Implement alternative measures such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM), project phasing, or other appropriate measures determined by the County that will avoid the impact. <p>TRP 4.11: Encourage land use development patterns and support technologies that reduce the demand for increased capacity on roadways.</p> <p>TRP 4.12: Ensure that proposed roads on unopened public rights-of-way are constructed to appropriate County standards based on their function, location, projected traffic, and potential for future circulation.</p>
<p>Land Development Standards</p>	
	<p>TRP 11.3: In order to provide needed improvements to local access roads that function as collectors and ensure that appropriate standards are applied, consider developing a local functional classification system that includes sub-classifications for local access roads.</p>

Chapter 11—Utilities

The Utilities Element is a comprehensive planning element required by the GMA. The Utilities Element is required to include the general location, proposed location, and capacity of all existing and proposed utilities, including, but not limited to, electrical lines, telecommunication lines and natural gas lines.

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update includes amendments to the Utilities Element to address utilities related to the addition of the Tri Area as a Urban Growth Area (UGA), as well as updated information on other County utilities. The addition of a UGA was contemplated in the 1998 Plan and completed in 2001. The Tri Area-related information included in the Utilities Element Update provides information on surface and groundwater available to the UGA,

Other updated Utilities information includes updated water systems data for the entire County; updated stormwater management text and issues, including acknowledgement and support of the state stormwater management framework and Jefferson County’s adoption of Ecology’s 2001 Stormwater Management Manual; updated future solid waste needs; and updated future water needs. The Utilities Element goals and policies remain unchanged from those presented in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan.

Chapter 12—Capital Facilities

The Capital Facilities Element is a comprehensive planning element required by the GMA. A CFP is required to provide for and accommodate capital facilities, establish and maintain standards for the level of service (LOS) of those capital facilities, and adequate plan for facility costs. Planning for capital facilities is closely linked with other Plan elements.

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update accommodates the six-year Capital Facilities Plan for years 2005-2010 and

provides revenue summaries in 2004 dollars. The Plan Update includes LOS revisions and refinements. The Element revision also includes stormwater management and flood control facilities text to acknowledge adoption of Ecology's 2001 Stormwater Management Manual and WDOT's Highway Runoff Manual, along with updated financing plan sources. The Capital Facilities Element goals and policies include only minor text revisions and does not propose new goals or policies.

Critical Areas Review

The GMA was amended in the late 1990s to include the requirement that local jurisdictions consider "best available science" (BAS) when establishing protection measures for critical areas. [See Part Nine of Chapter 365-195 WAC.] The 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan included policies within the Environment Element to incorporate BAS for critical areas. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update, as proposed, amends the Environment Element to include BAS for critical areas as goals with supporting policies (see discussion of Environment Element, below). In addition to the proposed Comprehensive Plan updated language related to BAS, several amendments are proposed within Section 3 of the UDC to incorporate BAS.

In 2000, Jefferson County completed a BAS review for critical areas and incorporated the findings into the land use controls for critical areas included in the UDC. The 2004 BAS review is not a departure from either state or Jefferson County BAS policy, but merely an updated review to incorporate the most recent science into land use controls in preparation growth planning within the County.

The recent science that Jefferson County has reviewed and proposes to include in the UDC are:

- Recommendations for wetland buffers included in the Model Ordinance recommended by the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED, 2003)
This science would result in an increase in Category I and Category IV wetland buffers as follows:
 - Standard buffers from 150 feet to 200 feet for Category I wetlands and from 25 feet to 35 feet for Category IV wetlands.
 - Buffers associated with a waiver from delineation and special report requirements from 225 feet to 300 feet for Category I wetlands and from 37 feet to 52 feet for Category IV wetlands.
- Interim stream classification system used by the Washington State Department of Natural Resources (WDNR)
This science would result in a change in the stream classification system for Jefferson County.
 - WDNR's typing system provides stream classifications. The old classification system included five stream classifications with buffers ranging from 50 feet to 150 feet. The new system includes four classifications with the same range of buffers.
 - The new classification system provides a basis for regulating channel migration zones. Channel migration zones are proposed to be regulated through UDC Section 3.6.7, Geologically Hazardous Areas.
- Marine shoreline rule changes: A review of the marine shorelines rules for Jefferson County resulted in several additions to fully support fish and wildlife habitat conservation area protections required under RCW 36.70A.030(5). The additions include 100 foot standard shoreline buffers, building setbacks, and marine shoreline bank protection standards. In addition Staff propose to add the word "conservation" to descriptions, requirements, and controls described in the UDC as "fish and wildlife habitat areas". The addition of the word "conservation" provides consistency with RCW 36.70A.030(5) fish and wildlife habitat conservation area language.
- Wildlife habitat rule change: A review of wildlife habit rules for the entire County has resulted in proposed requirements for habitat management plan preparation to augment fish and wildlife habitat conservation area protection and preservation. Jefferson County will be able to maintain existing wildlife habitat through additional subdivision standards that require preparation of habitat management plans in core wildlife habitat areas.

2.3.2.2.1.2 *MLA04-28B*

Comprehensive Plan Update Completed By the Planning Commission

The Jefferson County Planning Commission completed the five-year assessment of the Comprehensive Plan pursuant to Section 9, subsection 9.5.4, of the Unified Development Code (UDC). Prior to initiation of the analysis, the Jefferson County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC), recognizing that the Comprehensive Plan, along with plans and regulations stemming from the Comprehensive Planning process, would require analysis and updating, requested that the Planning Commission review the Comprehensive Plan and UDC. The BOCC also requested that the Planning Commission review the Comprehensive Plan for obsolete language and "indulgence of verbosity" to create a more useful, concise, and readable document. The Planning Commission appointed a Comprehensive Plan Review Committee, which streamlined the Plan. Plan revisions are primarily related to removal of references to and discussion of interim measures to be followed and goals and policies to be implemented leading to adoption of the Jefferson County Unified Development Code (UDC) to guide and regulate development, and designation of urban growth areas (UGAs) where more intensive development may occur within the County. The goals that the Planning Commission followed in updating the Comprehensive Plan are included as Appendix Items, but are generally summarized as follows:

- Revise and refine the 1998 Comprehensive Plan goals and policies and add new goals and policies, but not markedly depart from the original Plan vision
- Include revisions that may be needed because of court or Growth Management Hearings Board decisions and GMA changes
- Address changes that have occurred within the County and to the Comprehensive Plan since adoption of the Plan in 1998
- Acknowledge the UDC as the primary tool for decision-making for development proposals while retaining the intent of the Plan goals and policies.

Revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, as presented by the Planning Commission occur in the following Plan Elements:

- 01—Introduction (incorporating the former second element: Plan Implementation and Monitoring)
- 03—Land Use and Rural
- 05—Housing
- 06—Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation
- 07—Economic Development
- 08—Environment.

The primary text and policy amendments include the following:

Revisions associated with court or Growth Management Hearing Board decisions or changes to GMA:

- Revisions to the Rural and Land Use Element policies on commercial lands to incorporate state law
- Rewrite of the Economic Development Element that generally maintains the same intent of the existing element
- Addition of new or updated information since adoption of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, including County adoption of Ecology's 2001 *Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington*
- Technical and editorial refinements to Comprehensive Plan goals and policies
- Minor new policies in other elements.

The line-in/line-out amendments associated with the Planning Commission five-year assessment are included as Appendix Items. The following is a summary of substantive changes that have been made within each Plan Element presented by the Planning Commission.

Chapter 03—Land Use and Rural Element

The Land Use element of a comprehensive plan must be prepared in accordance with RCW 36.70A.070 of the Growth Management Act. Jefferson County, in preparing this comprehensive plan chapter opted to include a Rural Element within the Land Use Chapter. This element includes an identification of major issues that relate to rural

development, the projected dispersal of rural population growth, and rural development goals and guidelines. The Land Use and Rural Element chapter of the Comprehensive Plan establishes the County’s growth and development policies over the next twenty years. The Land Use and Rural Element addresses population densities, building intensities and estimates of population growth; the location of urban growth areas; and the proposed general distribution and general location and extent of the uses of land for agriculture, timber production, housing, commerce, industry, recreation, open spaces, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses.

Textual updates to the 1998 Comprehensive Plan include population data and dates to reflect 2024 planning horizon while acknowledging no shortage of existing, developable land to accommodate the projected population. The Update also includes text revisions, minor editorial changes, and supplemental policy text to support UDC requirements and allowed uses. Revision to replace descriptions of Rural Commercial Land planning assumptions with qualifying and designation criteria are also included, along with 2002 commercial area acreages, an undeveloped acreage update, a Rural Village Center infill acreage update, and an industrial land information update. The GMA-mandated review of surface water conditions acknowledges the County’s adoption of Ecology’s 2001 Stormwater Management Manual and highlights Jefferson County’s current surface water concerns. Policy changes included in the Update are described below; minor editorial changes to goals and policies, including the addition or removal of goal or policy qualifiers, are not noted here.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
General Land Use	
<p>LNP 1.3: Revised to remove 5-year update schedule and maintain GMA-required update consistency. LNP 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.8, 1.11: Outdated policies related to regulation and process development removed.</p>	
Rural Residential Land Use	
<p>LNG 2.0 and LNP 2.1: Outdated goal and policy related to Comprehensive Plan element land use goal and policy consistency removed</p>	
Rural Commercial Land Use	
<p>LNP 4.3: Outdated policy and subpolicies related to establishing boundaries removed. LNP 4.6, 4.7, and 4.8: Outdated policies related to creation of development standards, designation and boundary modification procedure, and Brinnon commercial development removed. LNP 5.7, 5.8: Outdated policies related to creation of development standards and interim boundaries removed.</p>	
Home-Based Businesses and Cottage Industries	
<p>LNP 6.1.1, 6.1.6: Policies combined with 6.1.1 revised to require that operators of home-based businesses must be owner or lessee and 6.1.6 deleted. LNP 6.1.12: Policy on hours of operation removed LNP 6.1.14: Policy remains, but outdated language pre-dating Brinnon subarea adoption removed. LNP 6.2.3, 6.2.4, 6.2.8, 6.2.11, 6.2.14: Outdated cottage industry qualifying policies removed.</p>	
Small-Scale Recreational and Tourist Related Uses	
<p>LNP 7.1 and most related subpolicies: Policy and subpolicies related to conditional use permit requirement, uses and qualifiers removed.</p>	
Legal Existing Uses	
<p>LNP 8 Subpolicy 8.5.2(b): Outdated subpolicy related to Glen Cove removed.</p>	

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
LNP 8.9.2: Outdated policy related to architectural style removed	
Capital Facilities	
LNP 10.1: Outdated policy related to urban infrastructure expansion and Plan concurrency removed.	
Industrial Land Uses	
<p>LNG 11.0: Removed</p> <p>LNP 11.1: Removed</p> <p>LNP 11.2: Removed</p> <p>LNP 12.4.1, 12.4.2: Outdated approval and use criteria removed.</p>	<p>LNG 11.0: Identify and designate sufficient land area within the County for future industrial uses and economic development.</p> <p>LNP 11.0: Major industrial development shall be located within Urban Growth Areas and may be provided for by the conditional use permitting process and allowed in rural areas consistent with all the criteria in RCW 36.70A.365.</p> <p>LNP 11.2: Establish an Industrial Land Bank in close proximity to a UGA for the siting of major industrial developments outside designated Urban Growth Areas that is consistent with RCW 36.70A.365 and 36.70A.367.</p>
Natural Resource Lands	
LNP 13.2: Outdated regulation language integration policy removed.	
Environment	
<p>LNP 14.1, 14.4: Outdated CAO compliance and shoreline protection policies removed.</p> <p>LNP 14.7: Outdated policy on land uses at Nordland.</p>	
Housing	
	LNP 15.3: Consider existing platted developments for designation as Residential Areas of Intense Development (RAID).
Essential Public Facilities	
LNP 16.5: Removal of outdated policy on siting public facilities.	
Transportation	
LNP 17.5 Removal of outdated language on rural area protection.	
Rural Character	
<p>LNG 18.0: Goal re-written without changing goal intent.</p> <p>LNP 18.2, 18.3: Outdated policies on environmental regulation and level of service standard development removed.</p> <p>LNG 19.0 and related policies: Goal and policies related to forest corridor concept removed.</p>	LNP 18.6: Endorse the extension of the forest corridor concept from Port Townsend's City limits south along SR 20 to the southerly extent of the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Study area to preserve and protect the forest corridor, and to provide a visual buffer between the roadway and new commercial and manufacturing development. Require planting when necessary to enhance the buffer, and the replanting of native and non-native species to replace trees and vegetation removed during development.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
<p>LNG 20.0 and related policies: Goal and policies related to rural community support removed.</p> <p>LNP 21.2, 21.4: Outdated policies related to project mitigation and roadway use removed.</p> <p>LNP 22.1 and subpolicies, 22.2 and subpolicies, 22.5: Outdated policies related to uses and densities in rural areas removed.</p> <p>LNP 23.1, 23.2, 23.3, 23.5, 23.6, 23.7: Policies related to cluster development removed.</p> <p>LNP 24.2: Policy revised to reflect GMA mandate of natural resource industry protection.</p>	
<p>Drainage, Flooding, Stormwater Management & Polluted Discharges</p>	
<p>LNP 30.6: Policy related to watershed action plans removed.</p>	

Chapter 05—Housing

The GMA (RCW 36.70A.070) requires that the Housing Element of a comprehensive plan integrate the relevant county-wide policies; include an inventory and analysis of existing and projected housing needs based on population projections; include a statement of goals, objectives and policies for the preservation, improvement, and development of housing; identify sufficient land for housing; and provide adequate provisions for existing and projected needs of all economic segments of the community. The primary purpose of these requirements is to determine the future housing needs and availability. The 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan Housing Element includes these housing-related components, but has been updated to adjust for altered growth targets.

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update includes revisions to the 1998 Plan to remove outdated housing size, type, affordability, and resource information and reflect the 2024 planning horizon. In addition, the housing strategy has been revised to remove outdated information. The Update also includes minor editorial changes and supplemental text. The updated Housing Element includes goal and policy changes to support affordability, centralized growth, and special needs populations.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
<p>HSG 1.0: Housing supply choices added to include single family detached units, multi-family residences, and special needs house that is affordable through local employment.</p> <p>HSP 2.5: Outdated policy on accessory dwellings removed.</p> <p>HSG 3.0 and related policies: Removal of goal and related policies on creating programs to conserve and improve existing housing.</p> <p>HSG 4.0: Goal revised and expanded to include examples without changing goal intent.</p> <p>HSP 4.1, 4.2: Relevant content of policies added to HSG 4.0; policies removed.</p>	<p>HSP 1.5: Coordinate with and promote an economic development strategy that creates adequate income for available housing resources.</p> <p>HSP 2.8: Adopt regulations that will encourage and promote growth within Urban Growth Areas.</p>

Chapter 06—Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation

Retention of open space and the development of parks and recreational opportunities is encouraged under the GMA while conserving fish and wildlife habitat, increasing access to natural resource lands and water, and developing parks. The Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation Element of the 1998 Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan provides goal and policy direction for meeting these GMA challenges.

The Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation Element text revisions as part of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan update include minor editorial changes and supplemental text to update County park, recreation, and open space information. The Plan Update also acknowledges the Jefferson County Parks, Recreation & Open Space Plan. Minor goal and policy revision are included in the Plan Update; the policy direction, however, remains unchanged.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
Open Space	
OSP 2.10: Outdated policy removal.	
Parks and Recreation	
OSP 4.10: Policy moved to OSP 4.1 OSP 5.3, 5.4: Policies removed.	

Chapter 07—Economic Development

The GMA does not require, but rather encourages, that a separate economic development element be included in a jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan or as part of the goals, policies, and strategies of each of the other elements. Jefferson County opted to include a separate Economic Development Element, presented in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan as Element 07. This element was rewritten as part of the 2004 Plan Update Element using updated language and concepts to provide economic development support to other elements, while maintaining the intent of the original Element. Business, education, and industrial lands policies have been updated to provide support through retention of a portion of the existing goals and policies and addition of new goals and policies. Major policy changes are described below.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
<p>EDG 1.0: Goal language removed.</p> <p>EDG 2.0: Language enhanced.</p> <p>EDP 2.1: Language derived from previous policy EDP 2.3.</p> <p>EDP 2.2: Language derived from previous policy EDP 2.6</p> <p>EDP 2.3: Language derived from previous policy EDP 2.1 and 2.2.</p> <p>EDP 2.4: Policies removed in language streamlining.</p> <p>EDP 6.1 and subpolicy 6.1.1: Outdated policies removed.</p>	<p>EDG 1.0: Make Jefferson County the best place to work, live, and conduct business by creating a diverse sustainable economy.</p> <p>EDP 2.4: Repeat of EDG 2.0.</p> <p>EDP 6.1: Use land designations such as Industrial Land Banks (ILB), Major Industrial Developments (MID), Urban Growth Areas (UGA), Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD), Rural Village Centers, Rural Crossroads, and the allowed uses specific to each designation to support regional alliances and economic clusters to attract investment and sustain economic activity.</p>

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
<p>EDP 5.5, 6.7, 6.8: Policies on business types removed.</p> <p>EDG 7.0, EDP 7.1: Healthy community concept added.</p> <p>EDP 8.1, 7.6, 7.7: Visitor destination and accommodation support policies removed.</p> <p>EDP 9.1: Outdated environment impact policy removed.</p> <p>EDP 10.6: Outdated policy of Port Townsend industrial properties removed.</p>	<p>EDP 6.5: Encourage senior living facilities that have multi-modal access to commercial districts and health care facilities.</p> <p>EDP 6.11: Assist the Port of Port Townsend with protecting Jefferson County International Airport as an Essential Public Facility and collaborate with the Port to expand allowed uses at the Airport to ensure its continued economic success.</p> <p>EDP 6.12: Protect the Port of Port Townsend’s industrial properties, waterfront and all other public assets entrusted and managed by the Port and established by legislative mandate to enhance economic vitality and quality of life for the citizens of Jefferson County.</p> <p>EDP 7.3: Create facilities to meet the needs of an aging population; health care, recreation, housing, and social services must be accessible and able to adapt as the population ages.</p> <p>EDP 10.5: Protect Jefferson County International Airport as an Essential Public Facility from incompatible development.</p>

Chapter 08—Environment

The GMA requires that the environment be protected to enhance the state’s high quality of life, including air and water quality, and the availability of water. The Environment Element of Jefferson County’s 1998 Comprehensive Plan was updated to acknowledge Jefferson County’s adoption of Ecology’s 2001 Stormwater Management Manual, Natural Heritage Program, and the integration of best available science. Major goal and policy changes that support the updated text are described below.

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
Shorelines	
<p>ENP 5.2: Policy related to sediment transport removed.</p> <p>ENP 5.7: Policy amended to reference consistency with WDOE’s SMM.</p>	
Air Quality	
<p>ENP 6.3: Policy text streamlined without changing intent.</p>	
Natural Heritage Vegetation and Landforms	
<p>ENG 7.0: Policy amended to reference collaboration with state programs including the Washington Natural Heritage Program without changing the intent of the goal.</p> <p>ENP 7.1: Policy language incorporated in ENG 7.0 and policy removed.</p>	

1998 Comprehensive Plan Goal and Policy Changes As Part of the 2004 Update	2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Additional Goals and Policies
Critical Areas Regulated Under the Critical Areas Ordinance	
<p>ENG 9.0: Goal re-worded without changing goal intent.</p> <p>ENG 10.0: Existing seismic risk goal deleted and replaced with a duplicate of ENG 7.0 referencing the Washington Natural Heritage Program.</p> <p>ENP 10.1: Policy removed.</p> <p>ENG 11.0: Existing goal removed and replaced with flood hazard area policy 11.0 referencing best available science.</p> <p>ENP 11.5, 11.6: Outdated policies related to allowed uses within flood plains removed.</p> <p>ENG 13.0: Existing goal removed and replaced with policy 13.1 referencing best available science.</p> <p>ENG 14.0: Goal reworded without altering goal intent.</p>	

Site-Specific Rezone

The Planning Commission proposal also includes one site-specific re-zone. The Planning Commission proposes that the 18.1-acre parcel that houses the Wheel-In Motor Movie drive-in theater off Theater Road and just south of the intersection of SR 19 and SR 20 be re-designated General Crossroad (a rural commercial designation) from its current Rural Residential 1:10 (RR 1:10) designation. The parcel was down-zoned to RR 1:10 from commercial in 1998 with adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The reason for the original downzone was concern over an on-going traffic issue at the SR20/SR19 intersection. Since that time, SR 20 has been re-routed at its juncture with SR 19 and a traffic light installed to aid traffic flow. With the ease in traffic flow and the Planning Commission believes that designation for the drive-in theater property (Parcel Number 001-282-007) should be reconsidered.

The re-designation would allow uses described in UDC Section 3 within the 18.1 acres.

2.3.2.2.2 Cumulative Impact Analysis

Pursuant to UDC Section 9.8.1.b, the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners shall develop findings and conclusions that consider specific criteria. Those criteria, and staff evaluations, are as follows:

Whether circumstances related to the proposed amendment substantially changed since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan

The proposal a Comprehensive Plan Update to remove outdated text, goals, and policies within the Plan and to acknowledge amendments to the Plan that have occurred since Plan adoption in 1998. Since adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1998, Jefferson County has continually worked to update the Plan to follow the goals, objectives, and planning strategies reflected in the Plan, as well as the maintain GMA consistency. The result of following the guidance of the 1998 Plan has resulted in completion of many of the directives of the Plan, rendering the 1998 Plan language obsolete. The County has essentially created a new planning environment and the Comprehensive Plan must be streamlined and updated to reflect that environment. In addition, new population projections require integration into the Plan, as well as integration of level of service updates for transportation and capital facilities.

Circumstances related critical areas review and associated UDC amendments that accompanies the 2004 Comprehensive Plan update have not substantially changed since adoption of a Comprehensive Plan amendment in 2002 that integrated best available science concepts.

The site specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007 has resulted from changed circumstances related to the Comprehensive Plan, but from a transportation revision that could result in re-designation of the parcel.

Whether the assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid, or whether new information is available

For the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update, the concepts on which the Plan was based remain largely valid AND new information is available for integration into the Plan.

The critical areas review is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan BAS integration concepts of updating UDC critical areas criteria when new science becomes available.

Land use planning associated with the site-specific amendment proposal for Parcel 001-282-007 is consistent with the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Whether the proposed amendment reflects current widely held values

This consideration will become evident through public hearing and testimony before the Planning Commission.

Staff will include information related to UDC section 9.8.1.c in a memorandum to the Planning Commission in October concerning Part B of MLA04-28.

Following is environmental analysis presented in the format of the Non-Project Action Supplemental Sheet to the Environmental Checklist developed by the Department of Ecology pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Discussion of each change according to questions set forth in SEPA Rules:

Section D. Supplemental Sheet for Nonproject Actions

2.3.2.2.2.1 MLA04-28A

Question #1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Answer #1. The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan guides growth and development in the County and provides a basis for controls on discharges to water, emissions to air, release of toxic or hazardous substances, and production of noise. Environmental review conducted for the 1998 Comprehensive Plan and reviews that have been conducted with Plan Amendments remain largely relevant in relation to these elements of the environment. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update would not increase impacts to these environmental elements. The effects of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update on elements of the environment are summarized below and supported in the last Appendix Item, which is an EIS Addendum.

The critical area review proposal would augment existing UDC controls to prevent discharges to water or release of toxic or hazardous substances.

Question #2 How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Answer #2. Growth in Jefferson County could have both direct and indirect impacts on plants, animals, fish and marine life that can involve both population and habitat loss. The potential effects on plants, animals, fish, and marine life can be minimized through implementation of federal, state, and County regulations, including critical area regulations. Effects of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update on plants, animals, fish, and marine life are summarized below and supported in the last Appendix Item.

The critical area review proposal would augment existing UDC controls to protect plants, animals, fish, and marine life.

Question #3 How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Answer #3. The concepts of energy and natural resource conservation and protection for Jefferson County's future is integrated in its Comprehensive Plan to reduce the effects of development now and in the future. These built-in protections in the Plan include planning for future populations by promoting centralized residential areas with nearby commercial centers, along with planning efficient transportation systems.

The critical areas review proposal would not deplete energy or natural resources.

Question #4 How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands.

Answer #4. Refer to Answer #2. The proposals take into consideration Critical Areas established by the County. Jefferson County has mapped Critical Areas and included within an overlay district governed by the UDC. The UDC includes built-in mitigation for growth-related Critical Areas impacts through control of land uses and development related activities. In addition, protections for runoff control, and habitat retention and buffers are required. The purpose of these UDC-base requirements is to safeguard public health, safety, and welfare by placing limitations on development in Critical Areas, which is in keeping with the requirements placed on jurisdictions by the GMA.

The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update goal and policy revisions may help to lower the effects of growth on environmentally sensitive areas, endangered species, and natural systems through proficient planning and growth monitoring.

The critical areas review proposal would enhance protections for environmentally sensitive areas.

Question #5 How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Answer #5. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update primarily streamlines the 1998 Plan to remove outdated goals, policies, and interim Plan direction. The 2004 Update would not encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans. Nothing in these Plan Update changes the County's Shoreline Master Program provisions. The effects of the Plan Update on land and shoreline uses are further defined in the summary below and supported in the Review of BAS included as an Appendix Item, as well as the EIS Addendum (last Appendix Item).

The critical areas review proposal would enhance UDC-based shoreline protections for both fresh and marine waters.

Question #6 How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Answer #6. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update would not increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities. Additional growth likely to occur within Jefferson County will likely contribute to demand for additional transportation improvements, along with public services and utilities. Analysis indicates that projected future land use County-wide can be accommodated with the recommended 2024 transportation improvements in place. Development would likely enhance assessed valuation, tax base, and revenues available to the affected jurisdictions and special districts for providing services. The effects of the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update on the transportation and public service and utilities elements of the environment are provided in the summary below (see also EIS Addendum Appendix Item). Nothing in the Plan Update will increase demands over those anticipated in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, as amended.

The critical areas review proposal would not increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities.

Question #7 Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

Answer #7. The Comprehensive plan has maintained consistency with the GMA by accommodating anticipated urban and rural population growth for the next 20-year period. Public involvement during the planning process has been extensive. As required by GMA, Jefferson County will submit its proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to the Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development for review. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan references use of other local, state, and federal laws and requirements as necessary and as required. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update will not conflict with any local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

The critical areas review proposal integrates science associated with upcoming environmental protection legislation and is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws and requirements.

2.3.2.2.2 MLA04-28B

Question #1. How would the proposal be likely to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise?

Answer #1: Refer to Answer #1 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #1: The site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007 has the potential, through project action implementation, to increase discharge to water; emissions to air; production, storage, or release of toxic or hazardous substances; or production of noise. Project-specific environmental review would be necessary for projects that may be proposed under the General Crossroads designation.

Question #2 How would the proposal be likely to affect plants, animals, fish, or marine life?

Answer #2: Refer to Answer #2 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #2: Site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007: refer to Answer #1.

Question #3 How would the proposal be likely to deplete energy or natural resources?

Answer #3: Refer to Answer #3 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #3: Site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007: refer to Answer #1.

Question #4 How would the proposal be likely to use or affect environmentally sensitive areas or areas designated (or eligible or under study) for governmental protection; such as parks, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, threatened or endangered species habitat, historic or cultural sites, wetlands, floodplains, or prime farmlands.

Answer #4: Refer to Answer #4 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #4: Site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007: refer to Answer #1.

Question #5 How would the proposal be likely to affect land and shoreline use, including whether it would allow or encourage land or shoreline uses incompatible with existing plans?

Answer #5: Refer to Answer #5 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #5: Site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007: refer to Answer #1.

Question #6 How would the proposal be likely to increase demands on transportation or public services and utilities?

Answer #6: Refer to Answer #6 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #6: Site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007: refer to Answer #1.

Question #7 Identify, if possible, whether the proposal may conflict with local, state, or federal laws or requirements for the protection of the environment.

Answer #7: Refer to Answer #7 in Section 2.3.2.2.2.1 for response to this question in relation to the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Update.

Answer #7: Site-specific rezone request for Parcel 001-282-007: refer to Answer #1.

The following table presents analysis with regard to specific elements of the environment (earth, air, water, etc.):

Earth	
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS described existing conditions for the earth elements of geology, soils, topography, and erosion/accretion. The discussion of the elements remains largely relevant. Since completion and issuance of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan and Draft EIS, Jefferson County has adopted its UDC which governs land use and development within the County, as guided by the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The UDC includes listings of allowable and prohibited uses within individual areas of the County. In addition, geologically hazardous areas (including seismic and mine hazard areas), mineral resource lands, and other environmentally sensitive areas that fit within the earth elements are identified and categorized as overlay districts, each with unique regulations and allowable uses.</p>	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Earth Elements</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan revisions have primarily been undertaken to update growth targets, update LOS standards for Transportation and Capital Facilities, and to streamline the Plan to more closely match changes that have occurred since implementation of the Plan in 1998. Changes to goals and policies that may affect earth elements primarily fall into the language streamlining category. One goal change is included in the Plan Update that affects earth elements. The seismic risk goal with the Environment Element was replaced with language that references use of the Washington Natural Heritage Program as a base for seismic risk policies.</p>	<p>Updated Plan Features</p> <p>To be consistent with the GMA, Jefferson County has developed goals policies that identify geologically hazardous areas and that ensure development within these areas will minimize risk to life and property. Changes to goals and policies include re-wording of ENG 9.0 and a change to ENG 10.0.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENG 9.0: Ensure that landslide and erosion hazard areas are appropriately designated and that measures to protect public health and safety are set for hazardous areas. • ENG 10.0: Encourage collaboration with state programs such as the Washington Natural Heritage Program and local conservation groups to identify native plants, plant communities, habitats and landforms which reflect the County's unique natural heritage.
Air	
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS described existing conditions for the air element of air quality. The discussion of the elements remains largely relevant for this Addendum. Since completion and issuance of the 1998 Plan and Draft EIS, Jefferson County has adopted its UDC which governs land use and development within the County, as guided by the Comprehensive Plan. The UDC includes development standards that address air quality issues that may occur with development, including fugitive dust.</p>	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Air Quality</p> <p>The primary plan change that affects air quality is the addition of stronger language for promotion of centralized residential growth and industrial areas. Centralized residential growth and industrial uses can lead to decreases of traffic on County roadways and may result in a concomitant decrease in vehicular pollutant emissions.</p>	<p>Updated Plan Features</p> <p>The primary Plan Update goal and/or policy changes that may affect air quality are the land use goal of providing industrial land area in and near urban growth areas and making provision for concentration of residential uses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LNP 11.0: Major industrial development shall be located within Urban Growth Areas and may be provided for by the conditional use permitting process and allowed in rural areas consistent with all the criteria in RCW 36.70A.365. • LNP 11.2: Establish an Industrial Land Bank in

	<p>close proximity to a UGA for the siting of major industrial developments outside designated Urban Growth Areas that is consistent with RCW 36.70A.365 and 36.70A.367.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LNP 15.3: Consider existing platted developments for designation as Residential Areas of Intense Development (RAID). • HSP 2.8: Adopt regulations that will encourage and promote growth within Urban Growth Areas. • TRP 4.11: Encourage land use development patterns and support technologies that reduce the demand for increased capacity on roadways.
<p>Water</p>	
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS described existing conditions for the water elements of surface water (including wetlands and floodplains) and groundwater (including water supplies and aquifers). Since issuance of the 1998 Plan and Draft EIS, Jefferson County has amended the Comprehensive Plan and has adopted its UDC which governs land use and development within the County, as guided by the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The UDC regulates the GMA-mandated critical areas components as land use overlay districts, including Environmentally Sensitive Areas District (ESA), Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, Frequently Flooded Areas, Fish and Wildlife Habitat Areas, and Wetlands. These overlay districts include listings of allowable and prohibited uses within and guide growth around critical areas. Performance and development standards of the UDC support preservation of surface and groundwater. Marine shorelines within Jefferson County are regulated through the County's Shoreline Management Program, which remains in effect until 2011, when it must be updated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan was amended in 2001 to comply with the WWGMHB decision requiring amendments to the Land Use and Rural Element to provide guidance for drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff. • The Jefferson County UDC was amended in 2002 to adopted the Washington State Department of Ecology 2001 Stormwater Management Manual (SMM) for Western Washington. The SMM is a set of stormwater management standards that applied to all new development and redevelopment in Jefferson County. The 2001 SMM was implemented in the County in 2003. • The Comprehensive Plan and the UDC were amended in 2003 to incorporate policies for protection of groundwater against seawater intrusion. • The Comprehensive Plan and the UDC were amended in 2004 as part of a growth management compliance process to include three types of Seawater Intrusion Protection Zones (SIPZ) within the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas overlay district regulated through the UDC. 	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Water</p> <p>Plan revisions have primarily been undertaken to update growth targets, update LOS standards for Transportation and Capital Facilities, and to streamline the Plan to more closely match changes that have occurred since implementation of the Plan in 1998. Changes to goals and policies that may affect water-related issues primarily fall into the streamlining category. Plan goal and policy additions include promotion of the concept of</p>	<p>Updated Plan Applicable Goals and Policies</p> <p>LNP 15.3: Consider existing platted developments for designation as Residential Areas of Intense Development (RAID).</p> <p>ENP 5.7: Manage storm water for proposed and existing development in a manner consistent with Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington.</p>

<p>encouraging growth within centralized areas, reference to Jefferson County’s adoption of the WDOE 2001 SMM, reference to use of the Washington Natural Heritage Program, and update of flood hazard and aquifer recharge goals to reflect use of Best Available Science.</p>	<p>ENG 7.0: Encourage collaboration with state programs such as the Washington Natural Heritage Program and local conservation groups to identify and promote the protection of native plants, plant communities, habitats and landforms which reflect the County’s unique natural heritage.</p> <p>ENG 13.0: Aquifer recharge areas should be designated and managed based on the best available science.</p>
<p>Plants and Animals</p>	
<p>Discussion</p> <p>The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS described existing conditions for plants and animals, including habitat, and fish and shellfish. The discussion of the elements remains largely relevant for this Addendum. Since completion and issuance of the 1998 Plan and Draft EIS, Jefferson County has adopted its UDC which includes measures for vegetation, wildlife, and fish protections provided for through the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>The UDC provides land use controls in areas where there are critical or sensitive habitats and populations through land use overlay districts for environmentally sensitive areas, fish and wildlife habitat areas, and wetlands. These areas are mapped and included buffers as listed in the UDC.</p>	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Plants and Animals</p> <p>Changes to goals and policies that may affect plants and animals (including aquatic habitats and populations) primarily fall revisions to remove interim and outdated goals and policies, as well as to reference Best Available Science and use of the Washington Natural Heritage Program.</p>	<p>Updated Plan Features</p> <p>ENG 7.0: Encourage collaboration with state programs such as the Washington Natural Heritage Program and local conservation groups to identify and promote the protection of native plants, plant communities, habitats and landforms which reflect the County’s unique natural heritage.</p>

<p>Land Use</p> <p>Discussion</p> <p>The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS discussed the following SEPA Land And Shoreline Use subelements of Relationship to Existing Plans, Housing, Light and Glare, and Aesthetics. Since the content of the 1998 Draft EIS remains largely accurate, only those subelements that the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update affect are discussed in this Addendum. Much of the Affected Environment information contained within the 1998 Draft EIS sections remains accurate, but a portion of the information has been updated since issuance of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan, and as associated with the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update.</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan changes that have occurred since Plan adoption in 1998 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan was amended in 2001 to provide guidance for drainage, flooding, and stormwater runoff within the Land Use and Rural Element • The Comprehensive Plan was amended in 2001 to provide goals and policies within the Land Use and Rural Element for Master Planned Resorts, along with amended policies on Rural Residential densities. • The Brinnon Subarea Plan was adopted as a component of the Comprehensive Plan in 2002, with an epilogue to the Subarea Plan being adopted in 2004. • The Comprehensive Plan was amended in 2002 to adopt the designated Glen Cove Light Industrial District. • The Comprehensive Plan with also amended in 2002 to incorporate the Eastview Industrial Plat, Forest Transition Overlay, Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, Non-Motorized Transportation Plan, the Comprehensive Plan amendment process, and the Urban Growth Area boundary in the Hadlock/Irondale area. • The 2003 Comprehensive Plan amendments include the Phillips/Maki Mineral Resource Land Overlay District, the land use map amendment for a wooden boat building school within the Port Hadlock Rural Village Center, a land use map re-designation for approximately 40 acres from RR 1:20 to RR 1:10 district , policies to simplify and amend Agricultural Lands designation categories, and to add policy language to the Comprehensive Plan related to compliance with a Growth Management Hearings Board order concerning groundwater protection against seawater intrusion. • The Comprehensive Plan was amended in 2003 to include a designated 690-acre mineral resource land overlay in Shine-Thorndyke area, which was reaffirmed in 2004. 	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Land Use</p> <p><u>Land Use</u></p> <p>The Comprehensive plan has maintained consistency with the GMA by accommodating anticipated urban and rural population growth for the next 20-year period. Public involvement during the planning process has been extensive. As required by GMA, Jefferson County will submit its proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments to the Washington State Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development for review .</p> <p>Since issuance of the 1998 Draft EIS, land uses within various categories have changed within Jefferson County. Areas within land use categories, as of 2004, are included in Table ____.</p>	<p>Updated Plan Features</p> <p>LNP 1.3: Review and amend the Comprehensive Plan consistent with the requirements of the Growth Management Act. Revisions to the Land Use Map may be considered on an annual basis, and shall be in strict compliance with the Comprehensive Plan criteria.</p> <p>LNP 11.1: Major industrial development shall be located within Urban Growth Areas and may be provided for by the conditional use permitting process and allowed in rural areas consistent with all the criteria in RCW 36.70A.365.</p> <p>LNP 11.2: Establish an Industrial Land Bank in close proximity to a UGA for the siting of major industrial developments outside designated Urban Growth Areas</p>

<p>Commercial areas, both developed and available for development were inventoried in 2002. The reduction in commercial. Commercially zoned acreage has fallen from a total of 367.37 acres in 1998 to 238.69 in 2002, a reduction of 39%. The total commercial land inventoried within Rural Crossroads decreased from 171.22 acres to 118.57 acres, of which undeveloped land available for infill decreased 19% (32.57 acres) of the total in 1998 to 10.8% in 2002.</p> <p>Total land area within the Rural Village Centers (RVC) of Brinnon and Quilcene have also changed. The total land area within the Brinnon RVC has decreased slightly from 34.05 acres in 1998 to 33.86 acres in 2002, of which 40.8% is considered vacant. The Quilcene RVC has increases substantially from 53.30 acres to 72.29 acres, of which 35.3% is vacant. The residential lot supply completed in 1996 projected for the 20-year planning period to 2016, included in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan remains in effect for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update because adequate supply remains available for the projected 2024 horizon year population.</p> <p><u>Population</u></p> <p>The 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update was largely completed to accommodate a change in the County population growth targets from 2016 to 2024, a planning update required under the GMA. The 2024 horizon year population is expected to include 40,139 individuals within Jefferson County, an increase of 13,840 over the year 2000 population. The OFM estimates include a lower yearly average growth rate that was assumed in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. Jefferson County, in response to the 1998 projections planned for vacant land, housing, services, and environmental projections to accommodate a population that was expected to grow at a faster rate than is now assumed based upon 2004 projections. As a result, Jefferson County is well prepared, in terms of population-based planning, for the 2024 horizon year population.</p> <p><u>Housing</u></p> <p>As described above, population projections for the 2024 horizon year, and years between, are now assumed to be lower than the population that Jefferson County planned to accommodate. As a result housing inventories and estimates included in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan remain largely accurate and have not required updating.</p>	<p>that is consistent with RCW 36.70A.365 and 36.70A.367.</p> <p>LNP 15.3: Consider existing platted developments for designation as Residential Areas of Intense Development (RAID).</p> <p>LNP 18.6: Endorse the extension of the forest corridor concept from Port Townsend's City limits south along SR 20 to the southerly extent of the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Study area to preserve and protect the forest corridor, and to provide a visual buffer between the roadway and new commercial and manufacturing development. Require planting when necessary to enhance the buffer, and the replanting of native and non-native species to replace trees and vegetation removed during development.</p> <p>HSP 1.5: Coordinate with and promote an economic development strategy that creates adequate income for available housing resources.</p> <p>HSP 2.8: Adopt regulations that will encourage and promote growth within Urban Growth Areas.</p> <p>EDG 1.0: Make Jefferson County the best place to work, live, and conduct business by creating a diverse sustainable economy.</p> <p>EDP 6.1: Use land designations such as Industrial Land Banks (ILB), Major Industrial Developments (MID), Urban Growth Areas (UGA), Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD), Rural Village Centers, Rural Crossroads, and the allowed uses specific to each designation to support regional alliances and economic clusters to attract investment and sustain economic activity.</p> <p>EDP 6.5: Encourage senior living facilities that have multi-modal access to commercial districts and health care facilities.</p> <p>EDP 6.11: Assist the Port of Port Townsend with protecting Jefferson County International Airport as an Essential Public Facility and collaborate with the Port to expand allowed uses at the Airport to ensure its continued economic success.</p> <p>EDP 6.12: Protect the Port of Port Townsend's industrial properties, waterfront and all other public assets entrusted and managed by the Port and established by legislative mandate to enhance economic vitality and quality of life for the citizens of Jefferson County.</p>
---	---

	<p>TRP 1.10: Enhance urban qualities by applying appropriate urban standards in Urban Growth Areas and Master Planned Resorts.</p>
<p>Transportation</p>	
<p>Discussion The 1998 Draft EIS discussed the transportation issues of transportation systems, vehicular traffic & transit, air & waterborne travel, freight, and traffic hazards. Updated information is included in this Draft EIS Addendum. The Transportation Element presented in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan has been updated to meet the GMA-based transportation planning schedule. In addition, the Element addresses the addition of the Irondate-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA) Previous transportation-related Comprehensive Plan amendments include adoption of the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan in 2002.</p>	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Transportation Transportation systems are those that are motorized and non-motorized. The 395.85 miles of motorized County Road system, according to the most recent survey, includes the following: Major Rural Collectors: 34.66 miles Minor Rural Collectors: 101.65 miles Local Rural Access: 249.12 miles Urban Collectors: 1.54 miles Urban Access: 8.88 miles. There motorized system also include 26 County-owned bridges.</p> <p>Despite population increases, average accident rates on State routes within Jefferson County have decreased from 1.39 accidents per million vehicle miles of travel in 1996 to 0.89 accidents per million vehicle miles of travel in 2004. Transit ridership, including transit fixed routes, dial-a-ride, and special transit, has increased from 22,003 total passenger trips in 1998 to 23,970 passenger trips in 2004.</p> <p>Traffic forecasts were updated to provide the County with information from which to determine whether County adopted levels of service are adequate to accommodate the projected population on County transportation systems. Forecasts showed that several State routes located within Jefferson County will exceed their estimated capacity based on the designated LOS. The non-motorized transportation system currently exceeds its adopted LOS.</p> <p>Growth-Related Impacts Analysis indicates that projected future land use County-wide can be accommodated with the recommended 2024 transportation improvements in place. Additional intersection analysis would likely be required, along with additional programming at the end of the current planning phase.</p>	<p>Updated Plan Features TRP 1.11: Design roadways in the County Road system according to their functional classification and forecasted 20-year traffic demand.</p> <p>TRP 4.6: Require that subdivision and commercial project designs address the following issues: i. Frontage improvements and roadway features to meet urban design standards within the Irondale-Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area and, when appropriate, the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort.</p> <p>TRP 4.10: Ensure that new developments that would generate traffic that would significantly decrease the Level of Service below the adopted Level of Service Standard for an intersection or roadway segment not be approved without stipulations for mitigation. When a new development would lower the Level of Service below the adopted Level of Service Standard, require the development proponent to mitigate the impact by one of the following: 1. Construct improvements that restore the Level of Service to the adopted Level of Service Standard; 2. Contribute an impact fee that is a proportionate share of the cost of improvements related to the development; 3. Implement alternative measures such as Transportation Demand Management (TDM), project phasing, or other appropriate measures determined by the County that will avoid the impact.</p> <p>TRP 4.11: Encourage land use development patterns and support technologies that reduce the demand for increased capacity on roadways.</p> <p>TRP 4.12: Ensure that proposed roads on unopened public rights-of-way are constructed to appropriate County standards based on their function, location, projected traffic, and potential for future circulation.</p>

	<p>TRP 11.3: In order to provide needed improvements to local access roads that function as collectors and ensure that appropriate standards are applied, consider developing a local functional classification system that includes sub-classifications for local access roads.</p>
<p>Public Services and Utilities</p>	
<p>Discussion The 1998 Comprehensive Plan Draft EIS examined the Public Services and Utilities components of capital facilities levels of service, fire services, police services, schools, parks and recreation facilities, administrative and government offices, communication, water and stormwater, sewer, and solid waste. These issues are typically discussed in terms of the cost, both fiscally and environmentally, of providing public services and utilities as a result of implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Since issuance of the Comprehensive Plan, the primary Plan amendments that affects public services and utilities include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of the Airport Management Plan • Adoption of the Hadlock/Irondale UGA. 	
<p>Plan Changes That Affect Public Services and Utilities The primary changes in the 2004 Comprehensive Plan Update Utilities Element includes acknowledgement of the Tri Area as a Urban Growth Area (UGA) in terms of surface and groundwater within the UGA, acknowledgement and support of the state stormwater management framework and Jefferson County's adoption of WDOE's 2001 SMM; updated future solid waste needs; and updated future water needs.</p> <p>The discussion presented in the 1998 Draft EIS remains largely accurate, and the Element planning horizon of 2010 included in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan has not changed because overall population estimates are lower, but cost and level of service tables presented have been updated to reflect 2004 dollar values.</p>	<p>Updated Plan Features The Utilities Element goals and policies remain unchanged from those presented in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. Capital Facilities Element updates include: EDP 7.3: Create facilities to meet the needs of an aging population; health care, recreation, housing, and social services must be accessible and able to adapt as the population ages.</p> <p>EDP 10.5: Protect Jefferson County International Airport as an Essential Public Facility from incompatible development.</p>

2.3.2.2.3 Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends adoption of the proposed Comprehensive Plan text, tables, figures, goals, policies, and strategies.

3 Supporting Record, Analyses, and Materials

The table below lists existing environmental documents and other documents and information utilized for the development of this 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket DCD Staff Report and SEPA Addendum. This report supplements information presented in prior environmental documents prepared for adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, other legislative actions, and other County decisions and activities.

DATE	DOCUMENT	DOCUMENT EVALUATED
September 27, 1978	Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)	Proposed Comprehensive Plan (pre-GMA)
January 2, 1979	Final EIS (FEIS)	Proposed Comprehensive Plan
December 21, 1992	County-Wide Planning Policies (Res. No. 40-99)	
February 14, 1994	DEIS	Draft Implementing Ordinance for 1979 Comprehensive Plan
March 1, 1995	Existing Conditions	Alternatives for establishing GMA Comprehensive Plan
February 24, 1997	DEIS	Comprehensive Plan - February 24, 1997 draft
May 27, 1998	FEIS	Proposed Comprehensive Plan
August 3, 1998	Staff Responses to Questions	Proposed Comprehensive Plan
January 26, 1999	Land Use Inventory Report	Part of Special Study
January 26, 1999	Regional Economic Analysis and Forecast	Part of Special Study
June 30, 1999	Draft Supplemental EIS (DSEIS)	Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments (Task III of Tri-Area/Glen Cove Special Study)
August 18, 1999	Final Supplemental EIS (FSEIS) with addenda	Comprehensive Plan 1999 Amendments (Task IV of Tri-Area/Glen Cove Special Study)
June 11, 2001	Special Study Final Decision Document	
November 2001	Tri-Area UGA Capital Facilities Special Study	
November 28, 2001	Tri Area & Glen Cove Special Study Implementation Plan	
August 21, 2002	Integrated Staff Report & DSEIS	2002 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket
November 25, 2002	Integrated FSEIS	2002 Amendment Docket
December 2002	Final decisions, findings, ordinances, and conditions	2002 Amendment Docket
February 13, 2003	Memorandum to Planning Commission	Agricultural Lands policy and regulation
April 28, 2003	Ordinance No. 05-0428-03 and all supporting documentation for MLA03-485	Amendments to UDC to implement Agriculture component of settlement agreement with Washington Environmental Council
August 6, 2003	Integrated Staff Reports & SEPA Addenda	2003 Amendment Docket
2004	Staff analysis and environmental review for Urban Growth Area (UGA).	MLA04-29 & 30: UGA plans, goals, policies, maps, and regulations.

4 Distribution List

Copies mailed or delivered to:

Jefferson County:

Planning Commission members (9 persons)

Board of County Commissioners

Prosecuting Attorney's Office

Department of Public Works

Department of Health & Human Services
Natural Resources Division

Jefferson County Library at Port Hadlock

State Agencies:

Dept. of Community, Trade and Economic
Development: Growth Management Services

Department of Ecology SEPA Unit

Notification of availability emailed or mailed to:

Jefferson County:

All other County departments not listed above

Local Agencies & Organizations:

City of Port Townsend
Jefferson County Public Utility District #1
Port of Port Townsend
Jefferson County Conservation District
Washington Environmental Council
Olympic Environmental Council
Wild Olympic Salmon
North Olympic Salmon Coalition
People for a Livable Community
Point-No-Point Treaty Council
Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe
Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe
Skokomish Tribe
Hoh Tribe
Port Townsend & Jefferson County Leader
Peninsula Daily News
Forks Forum
Vigilance

Notification of availability emailed or mailed to:

State Agencies:

Department of Natural Resources (Anne Sharar &
SEPA Review)

Department of Transportation (Bill Wiebe & SEPA
Review)

Department of Health (GMA/SEPA Review)

Department of Social & Health Services
(Elizabeth McNagny)

Department of Corrections (Nancy Winters)

Department of Fish & Wildlife (Steve Penland, Tim
Rymer, Jeff Davis & SEPA Review)

Department of Ecology (GMA Review & Donna
Bunten)

Puget Sound Action Team
(Harriet Beale and John Cambalik)

Parks & Recreation Commission (Bill Koss)

Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation
(Lorinda Anderson)

Governor's Salmon Recovery Office (Lloyd
Moody)

Other Interested Parties:

People for a Rural Quimper
Jefferson County Pilots Association
1000 Friends of Washington
Washington Association of Realtors
Washington State Association of Counties

5 Appendices

- Item 1: Legal Notice published September 22, 2004
- Item 2: Resolution 55-03 re: population projection and allocation
- Item 3: Proposed Airport Overlay District: 55-DNL noise contour map
- Item 4: MLA03-232 Staff Recommendation
- Item 5: MLA03-232 Table 3-1
- Item 6: Port of Port Townsend letter
- Item 7: List of Agricultural Lands Designation Requests
- Item 8: List of Recommended Denials and Anomalies re: Agricultural Lands requests
- Item 9: East Jefferson County Agricultural Lands including re-designation requests
- Item 10: West Jefferson County Agricultural Lands including re-designation requests
- Item 11: Public Works Memorandum re: Agricultural Lands and transportation
- Item 12: 010 Transportation Element (as it would appear in updated Plan)
- Item 13: 010 Transportation Element line-in/line-out version (without Figures)
- Item 14: Table 10-6 Existing & Forecast Ave. Daily Trips (ADT) & Levels of Service (LOS)
- Item 15: Utilities Element
- Item 16: Capital Facilities Element (with replacement tables rather than line-in/line-out amendments)
- Item 17: Review of Best Available Science
- Item 18: Proposed UDC Amendments per Review of Best Available Science
- Item 19: Planning Commission Comprehensive Plan Assessment and Amendment Criteria
- Item 20: 01 Introduction - Implementation and Monitoring (integrates former chapter 02)
- Item 21: 03 Land Use and Rural
- Item 22: 05 Housing
- Item 23: 06 Open Space, Parks and Recreation, and Historic Preservation
- Item 24: 07 Economic Development
- Item 25: 08 Environment
- Item 26: SR 19 & 20 General Crossroads map with adjacent parcel 001-282-007
- Item 27: Comprehensive Plan Update EIS Addendum

5.1 ITEM 1: LEGAL NOTICE (SEPTEMBER 22, 2004)

5.2 ITEM 2: RESOLUTION 55-03 RE: POPULATION PROJECTION AND ALLOCATION

5.3 ITEM 3: PROPOSED AIRPORT OVERLAY DISTRICT: 55-DNL NOISE CONTOUR MAP

5.4 ITEM 4: MLA03-232 STAFF RECOMMENDATION

5.5 ITEM 5: MLA03-232 TABLE 3-1

5.6 ITEM 6: PORT OF PORT TOWNSEND LETTER

5.7 ITEM 7: LIST OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS DESIGNATION REQUESTS

5.8 ITEM 8: LIST OF RECOMMENDED DENIALS AND ANOMALIES RE: AGRICULTURAL LANDS REQUESTS

5.9 ITEM 9: MAP OF EAST JEFFERSON COUNTY AGRICULTURAL LANDS INCLUDING RE- DESIGNATION REQUESTS

**5.10 ITEM 10: MAP OF WEST JEFFERSON COUNTY
AGRICULTURAL LANDS INCLUDING RE-
DESIGNATION REQUESTS**

**5.11 ITEM 11: PUBLIC WORKS MEMORANDUM RE:
AGRICULTURAL LANDS AND TRANSPORTATION**

5.12 ITEM 12: 010 TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT

This version is as it would appear in updated Plan (i.e., not a line-in/line-out version of 1998 Plan).

5.13 ITEM 13: 010 TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT LINE- IN/LINE-OUT VERSION

Does not include embedded Figures.

**5.14 ITEM 14: TABLE 10-6 EXISTING & FORECAST AVE.
DAILY TRIPS (ADT) & LEVELS OF SERVICE (LOS)**

5.15 ITEM 15: UTILITIES ELEMENT

5.16 ITEM 16: CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

This version presents replacement tables rather than line-in/line-out amendments to the 1998 Plan.

5.17 ITEM 17: REVIEW OF BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE

5.18 ITEM 18: PROPOSED UDC AMENDMENTS PER REVIEW OF BEST AVAILABLE SCIENCE

5.19 ITEM 19: PLANNING COMMISSION COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ASSESSMENT AND AMENDMENT CRITERIA

5.20 ITEM 20: 01 INTRODUCTION - IMPLEMENTATION AND MONITORING

The proposal integrates the former second chapter of the Comprehensive Plan—Plan Implementation and Monitoring—into the new, expanded Introduction. The Plan Implementation and Monitoring element was moved to the Appendices of the Comprehensive Plan upon adoption earlier in 2004 of a new chapter 2 focused on the Irondale and Hadlock Urban Growth Area.

5.21 ITEM 21: 03 LAND USE AND RURAL

5.22 ITEM 22: 05 HOUSING

5.23 ITEM 23: 06 OPEN SPACE, PARKS AND RECREATION, AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

5.24 ITEM 24: 07 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

5.25 ITEM 25: 08 ENVIRONMENT

5.26 ITEM 26: SR 19 & 20 GENERAL CROSSROADS MAP WITH ADJACENT PARCEL 001-282-007

A component of Part B of MLA04-28 is a recommendation that the Wheel-In Motor Movie drive-in theater be included in the rural commercial area.

5.27 ITEM 27: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE EIS ADDENDUM

“EIS” is an acronym for Environmental Impact Statement, a term of art under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). This integrated report supplements the EIS that accompanied adoption of the Comprehensive Plan in 1998.