CAPITAL FACILITIES

PURPOSE: The purpose of the Capital Facilities Element is to identify and provide for public capital facilities. ~~It is one of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan that is required by Washington's Growth Management Act (GMA).~~

Capital facilities generally have very long useful lives and significant costs. Public capital facilities include the capital improvements and systems of each of the following: airports, animal control shelters, community centers, corrections facilities, county administrative buildings, Superior and District Courts, fire protection and emergency medical services, police and sheriff services, hospitals, libraries, parks, roads, sanitary sewer, schools, solid waste, surface water management, transit, water.

Traditionally, public capital facilities strategic planning has involved developing "wish lists". Often there were limited external legal frameworks mandating implementation, and often no accountable link to land use planning. The Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates a significantly different approach. As a result, the Capital Facilities Element identifies a fully funded six-year capital facilities plan that supports Jefferson County's existing and projected population and the development as identified in the Comprehensive Plan's Land Use Element. The Capital Facilities Element contains the following components:

- An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by the County, and the location and capacity of these facilities.
- Establishment of Level of Service standards for public capital facilities based on quantifiable, objective measures of capacity.
- County population projections for Years 2005 – 2010.
- Determination of the public capital facilities necessary to serve future population based on the adopted Level of Service standards.
- Projected capital costs for those public capital facilities.
- A plan to finance those public capital facilities.

The Growth Management Act mandates that the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan should be internally consistent. Provision is made for regular assessment of the Capital Facilities Element and the other Elements of the Comprehensive Plan to maintain consistency between Plan Elements.

Element Amendment

This element is part of the 2004 Amendments to the 1998 Comprehensive Plan. The Growth Management Act requires that the County update the Comprehensive Plan every 6 years. This Amendment complies with that requirement.

Relationships with Other Comprehensive Plan Elements

The Capital Facilities Element is a plan to provide the public facilities necessary to support expected growth and development while achieving the community's vision expressed in other elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The Growth Management Act requires that the public facilities identified in the Capital Facilities Element be fully financed. If the public facilities identified cannot be fully financed, the County is required to modify the Comprehensive Plan through reduction of the current Level of Service standards, reduction of public facility costs, and/or modification of the Land Use Element to achieve balance with the public facilities the County is able to fund. This Growth Management Act requirement provides a realistic check on the vision articulated in the other Comprehensive Plan Elements. The Capital Facilities Element is the vehicle to ensure that the quality of life of the community envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan is consistently evaluated and clarified.

Capital Facilities Planning Approach: Adopting Levels of Service (LOS)

The Growth Management Act requires a forecast of the future needs for public capital facilities through adoption of Level of Service standards or ~~othe~~similar objective planning assumptions. Level of Service (LOS) is a measure of the amount of public facilities that will be provided for the community. Choosing a Level of Service is like making a choice from a menu: the selections offered we desire the most are often the most expensive, while the more affordable choices may not be as appealing. Likewise, the higher Levels of Service may provide a higher quality of life, but at greater cost. Lower Levels of Service may cost less, yet at the same time provide the County with "quality of life" not acceptable to the public. The method Jefferson County has used to choose Levels of Service enables the County to balance the desire for higher Levels of Service with the ability and willingness to pay for those Levels of Service.

The adopted Levels of Service serve two purposes. First, they will be used to calculate the quantity and cost of public facilities the County needs to finance. Second, they will be the standard to measure whether the County is achieving the requirement to provide public facilities adequate to support development. Adequacy of public facilities is determined by a comparison of the capacity of capital facilities necessary to serve proposed development with the unused capacity that is available. If the unused capacity is equal to, or greater than the capacity required, the facility is adequate. If the unused capacity is less than the capacity required, the facility is not adequate.

Typically, measures of Levels of Service are expressed as ratios of facility capacity to demand (i.e., actual or potential users). Table 12-1 lists examples of Levels of Service unit measures for typical public capital facilities:

Table 12-1
Level of Service (LOS) Unit Measurements

Type of Capital Facility	LOS Unit Measurement
Corrections Inmate Facilities	Beds/1,000 population
Sheriff Administrative Facilities	Building Square Feet/1,000 population
Parks	Acres/1,000 population
Roads and Streets	~~Ratio of actual~~Actual traffic volume to roadway design capacity
Sewer	Gallons per customer per day and effluent quality
Solid Waste	Pounds per capita per day

Each Level of Service measure requires the specific quantity that measures the current or proposed Level of Service.

Method for Using Levels of Service

The Growth Management Act requires the Capital Facilities Element (CFE) to be based on Levels of Service standards that are measurable and financially feasible for the six fiscal years following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. The Level of Service method answers two questions that must be addressed in order to develop a financially feasible Capital Facilities Element (CFE) that meets Growth Management Act requirements:

- What is the quantity of public facilities that will be required by the end of the six year planning period?
- Is it financially feasible to provide the quantity of facilities that are required by the end of the six year planning period?

The answer to each question has been calculated by using objective data and formulas. Each type of public facility is examined separately (i.e., roads are examined separately from parks). The costs of all the types of facilities are then combined in order to determine the financial feasibility of the Capital Facilities Element (CFE).

Establishing the Levels of Service (LOS) Standards

Because capital facilities capacity needs are largely determined by the Level of Service (LOS) standards adopted, the foundation of the Capital Facilities Element (CFE) is the selection of the Level of Service (LOS) standards. Levels of Service standards are measures of the quality of life of the community. The standards should be based on the County's vision of its future and its values.

Traditional approaches to capital facilities planning rely on technical experts (i.e., staff and consultants) to determine the need for capital improvements. In the "scenario-driven" approach used in this Element, these experts play an important advisory role, but they do not control the outcome. Their role is to define and implement a process for the review of various scenarios, to analyze data, and provide recommendations based on technical considerations.

The final, legal authority to establish LOS rests with the Board of County Commissioners because ~~it enac~~the Board adopts LOS that represents the ~~community~~County's vision. The Board's decisions are based, in part, upon review of recommendations provided by the following entities:

- The Jefferson County Planning Commission
- Providers of public facilities (e.g., County departments, special districts, private utilities, State of Washington, tribal governments, and others)
- The general public through individual citizens and community civic, business, and issue-based organizations that make their views known

An individual has many opportunities to influence the Level of Service (LOS) standards and all other aspects of the Comprehensive Plan. These opportunities include attending and participating in meetings, writing letters, responding to surveys or questionnaires, joining organizations that participate in the development of the Capital Facilities Element (CFE), providing testimony at the meetings of any group or government agency that influences the Level of Service (LOS) decision, and formal comment during the SEPA review process.

The scenario-driven approach to developing the Level of Service standards provides decision-makers and anyone else who wishes to participate with a clear statement of the outcomes of various Levels of Service for each type of public facility. This approach reduces the tendency for decisions to be controlled by staff or consultants, opens up the decision-making process to the public and places the decisions before the Board of County Commissioners.

~~formally adopted~~The Board of County Commissioners selected a six-year Capital Financial Plan, and the associated Level of Service standards, that meet the needs of the community.

The Level of Service standards are ~~adopt~~identified in the Capital Facilities Policy 1.1. The ~~adopted~~Level of Service standards are critical because:

- Level of Service standards (LOS) determine the need for capacity-related capital improvement projects (See Policy 2.1~~ and the Capital Improvements section~~).
- Level of Service standards (LOS) are the benchmark for evaluating the adequacy of public facilities for proposed development. (See Policy 3.2).

Population Growth Assumptions

This Capital Facilities Element is based on the following population data:

Table 12-2
Population Growth Assumptions

Year	Countywide
2005	28,308
2006	28,815
2007	29,327
2008	29,844
2009	30,366
2010	30,892

Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Cost Projections: 2005-2010

The 2005-2010 capital improvements cost projections are summarized~~identified~~ on Table 12-3.

Table 12-3
~~Type of Public Facilit~~County-Owned/Operated Public Facilities Capital Cost Summary

This Table Includes Both Capacity And Non-capacity Projects

Type of Public Facility	2005-2010 Cost in 2004 Dollars)
Animal Shelter	$30,000
Community Centers	$90,000
County Corrections Inmate Facilities	$105,000
County Sheriff Facilities	$30,000
County Justice Facilities	$30,000
County General Administrative Facilities	$275,500
~~Public Works Maintenance~~County Maintenance Shop Facilities	$275,000
Parks and Recreation Facilities	$1,118,000
Solid Waste Facilities	$1,489,000
Stormwater Management	$10,000
Flood Control Facilities	$0
Transportation	$8,273,000
Sewer System Facilities	$300,000
Water System Facilities	$0
TOTAL REQUIRED	$12,025,500

Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) Financing Strategy: 2005-2010

Table 12-4
Revenue Source Summary For Capacity Projects

Revenue Source	**2005-2010 Revenue** ~~(x $1000~~**(x $1000 in 2004 Dollars)**
Existing Revenue, Refer to Table 12-5A	$1,565,000 0
New Revenue, Refer to Table 12-5-B	$10,000
TOTAL REQUIRED	$1,575,000

TABLE 12-5A
FUNDING STRATEGIES FOR CAPACITY PROJECTS
EXISTING REVENUE SOURCES

CATEGORY/PROJECT	**FUNDING SOURCE**	**AMOUNT**
Animal Shelter		
None		$0
Community Centers		
None		$0
County Corrections Inmate Facilities		
None		$0
County Sheriff Facilities		
None		$0
County Justice Facilities		
None		$0
County General Administrative Facilities		
None		$0
County Maintenance Shop Facilities		
Quilcene Shop	ER&R Cash Balance	$250,000
Parks & Recreation Facilities		
Larry Scott Trail Extension	Grants & Donations	$1,118,000
Solid Waste Facilities		
Weigh Scale System & Access Imp	Solid Waste Fund Balance	$97,000
Access Improvements	Road Cash Balance	$100,000
Solid Waste Facilities		$0
Stormwater Management Facilities		$0
Transportation		$0
	Total	$1,565,000

RECAP

Public Vote	
G.O. Bonds	
Cash Balance	$447,000
Current Revenue	$1,118,000

	Fee Increases	
	Total	$1,565,000

TABLE 12-5B
FUNDING STRATEGIES FOR CAPACITY PROJECTS
NEW REVENUE SOURCES

CATEGORY/PROJECT	FUNDING SOURCE	AMOUNT
Animal Shelter		
None		$0
Community Centers		
None		$0
County Corrections Inmate Facilities		
None		$0
County Sheriff Facilities		
None		$0
County Justice Facilities		
None		$0
County General Administrative Facilities		
None		$0
County Maintenance Shop Facilities		
None		$0
Parks & Recreation Facilities		
None		$0
Solid Waste Facilities		
None		$0
Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control Facilities		
None		$0
Storm Water Mgt/Flood Control Facilities		
Port Hadlock Storm Sewer	Stormwater Fee	$10,000
Transportation		
None		$0
	Total	$10,000

RECAP

Public Vote	$0
G.O. Bonds	$0
Cash Balance	$0
Current Revenue	$0
Fee Increases	$10,000
Total	$10,000

Level Of Service (LOS) Impacts

The 2005-2010 Capital Facilities Six-Year Plan (CFP) enables Jefferson County to accommodate 9.1% population growth based on a projected 2010 population of 30,892 people. Modifications to Level of Service (LOS) standards for County-owned or managed facilities follow:

Table 12-6
Level Of Service (LOS) Standard: Status Quo

Facility	LOS Unit	Prior Standard	Proposed Standard
Parks, Regional	Acres/1,000 population	11.5	No change proposed
Parks, Community	Acres/1,000 population	0.51	No change proposed
Parks, Neighborhood	Acres/1,000 population	0.14	No change proposed
Parks, Trails	Miles/1,000 population	0.52	No change proposed
Parks, Campgrounds	Acres/1,000 population	1.30	No change proposed
Transportation	Level A, B, C, D, E, F	Rural: Level C	No change proposed
		Urban: Level D	No change proposed
		Master Plan Resort (MPR): Level D	No change proposed

Table 12-7
Level Of Service (LOS) Standard: Increased

Facility	LOS Unit	Prior Standard	Proposed Standard
Solid Waste, All Waste	Lbs./Person/Day	3.99 Lbs.	5.00 Lbs.
Solid Waste, Recycle	Recycle Rate	14%	16%
Solid Waste, Garbage	Lbs./Person/Day	2.83 Lbs.	4.20 Lbs.
Solid Waste, Recycle	Lbs./Person/Day	0.56 Lbs.	0.80 Lbs.

Table 12-7 Addendum
Updated in the 2002 Amendment to this Element

Facility	LOS Unit	1998 LOS Standard	CFP LOS Standard
Sewage Treatment	Gallons/ERU/day	230 Gallons	0 Gallons
Stormwater Management	N/A	N/A	Stormwater Management Manual for Western WA or WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual

Table 12-8
Level Of Service (LOS) Standard: Reduced

Facility	LOS Unit	Prior Standard	Proposed Standard
Animal Control Shelter	Sq. Ft/1,000 population	79.0 SF	74.9 SF
Community Centers	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,450 SF	1277.6 SF
Corrections Inmate Facilities	Beds/1,000 population	2.08 Beds	1.90 Beds
County Sheriff Facilities	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	656 SF	244.5 SF
County Justice Facilities	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,310 SF	732.4 SF
General Administrative Offices	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,860 SF	1,509.7 SF
Maintenance Shop Facilities	Sq. Ft./1,000 population	1,828 SF	1,078.9 SF

CAPITAL FACILITIES CONCEPT PLAN: 2005 – 2010

This section identifies capital improvement schedules and the financing plan for County owned and/or operated public facilities. Also included are inventories of existing facilities and the Level of Service standards.

Each category of public facility is presented in a separate subsection. Throughout this section, tables of data are identified with abbreviations that correspond to the category of public facility; for example, Table 12-CC-1 refers to Table 1 for CC (Community Centers). Each abbreviation corresponds to the category of County owned and/or operated public facility.

Inventory of Current Facilities: Table 1 information includes existing capital facilities, including the name, capacity (for reference to Levels of Service), and location.

Level of Service Capacity Analysis: Table 2 information summarizes facility capacity. The statistical table at the top calculates the amount of facility capacity that is required to achieve and maintain the standard for Level of Service. The capital improvement projects that are projected to provide the capacity required are listed below the requirements table, and the resulting capacity is reconciled to the total requirement.

Capital Projects and Financing Plan: Table 3 includes a schedule of capital improvements that are intended to provide the capacity required to meet growth, and replace existing facilities through December 31, 2010.

Individual capital improvement projects are identified. All cost projections are in 2004 dollars; no inflation factor has been applied because the costs will be revised as part of the regular review and update

of the Six-Year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). Capital improvement projects were prepared in association with the department managing the public facility.

Specific revenue sources and projected revenue amounts are shown. The revenue forecasts are based on data from various sources.

CAPITAL FACILITIES CONCEPT PLAN

ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER

Current Facilities: The County-owned Animal Control Shelter was constructed at Critter Lane in 1994. The Animal Control Shelter is available to residents of both the unincorporated and incorporated areas of the County. Table 12-AC-1, "Current Facilities Inventory", identifies the current facility capacity and location.

TABLE 12-AC-1
ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	Net Sq. Ft. Capacity
Animal Shelter	Critter Lane, Jefferson County	2,313
	Total	2,313

ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) requires only 1 square feet of additional space by the end of the planning period. The deficit of 1 square foot is not considered material and, therefore, does not require the inclusion of any capacity projects.

TABLE 12-AC-2

ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
74.9
Square Feet Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Square Feet Per Capita	Square Feet Change	Available Square Feet	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		2,120		2,313	193
2006	28,815	507	2,158	38	2,313	155
2007	29,327	512	2,197	39	2,313	116
2008	29,844	517	2,235	38	2,313	78
2009	30,366	522	2,274	39	2,313	39
2010	30,892	526	2,314	40	2,313	-1

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2007	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$0	0	0

Total Proposed	2,313	-1

ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER (continued)

TABLE 12-AC-3
ANIMAL CONTROL SHELTER

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	None	$0
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$0

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$30,000

Note: all non-capacity projects to be funded from the Construction Fund

COMMUNITY CENTERS

Current Facilities: The Brinnon Community Center was constructed during the 1960's with a major remodel during 1986. The Gardiner Community Center was constructed in 1978 with a major remodel in 1999. The Port Townsend Community Center was remodeled in 1991. The Quilcene Community Center was constructed in 1976 with a major addition in 1999. The Tri-Area community Center was constructed in 1981. The Coyle Community Center is not owned by the County; it is owned and managed by a special Park & Recreation District. Table 12-CC-1, "Current Facilities Inventory", identifies the current facility capacity and locations.

TABLE 12-CC-1

COMMUNITY CENTERS

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	Net Sq. Ft. Capacity
Brinnon Community Center	Brinnon	4,820
Gardiner Community Center	Gardiner	5,000
Port Townsend Community Center	Port Townsend	17,708
Quilcene Community Center	Quilcene	4,970
Tri Area Community Center	Chimacum	6,975
	Total	39,473

COMMUNITY CENTERS (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) will not require any additional space by the end of the planning period. No capacity projects are required.

TABLE 12-CC-2

COMMUNITY CENTERS

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
1,277.6
Square Feet Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Square Feet Per Capita	Square Feet Change	Available Square Feet	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		36,166		39,473	3,307
2006	28,815	504	36,814	648	39,473	2,659
2007	29,327	513	37,468	654	39,473	2,005
2008	29,844	522	38,129	661	39,473	1,344
2009	30,366	531	38,796	667	39,473	677
2010	30,892	540	39,468	672	39,473	5

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2007	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$0	0	0
		Total Proposed	39,473	5

COMMUNITY CENTERS (continued)

TABLE 12-CC-3
COMMUNITY CENTERS

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	None	$0
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$0

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment/Roof Replacement	$30,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment/Roof Replacement	$40,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$90,000

Note: all non-capacity projects to be funded from the Construction Fund

COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The Correctional Facility, located in Port Hadlock, was constructed in 1984 with a major addition in 1999. This facility serves both unincorporated and incorporated populations of the County. The current inventory of inmate beds in the corrections inmate facility totals 58. The facility also includes the Emergency Operations Center for the county. Table 12-CF-1 "Current Facilities Inventory," lists the facility as well as its current capacities and location.

TABLE 12-CF-1

INMATE CORRECTION FACILITIES

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	# Beds Capacity
Correction Facility	Port Hadlock	58
Clearwater Annex	Clearwater	0
	Total	58

COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) will require one additional bed by the end of the planning period. It is anticipated that if the one bed deficit actually occurs, the deficit will be addressed by transferring an inmate to a county with excess capacity.

TABLE 12-CF-2

INMATE CORRECTION FACILITIES

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
1.90
Beds Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Beds Per Capita	# Beds Change	Available Beds	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		54		58	4
2006	28,815	504	55	1	58	3
2007	29,327	513	56	1	58	2
2008	29,844	522	57	1	58	1
2009	30,366	531	58	1	58	0
2010	30,892	540	59	1	58	-1

CAPACITY PROJECTS

Proposed Projects		Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2007	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$0	0	0
		Total Proposed	58	-1

COUNTY CORRECTIONS INMATE FACILITIES (continued)

TABLE 12-CF-3
INMATE CORRECTIONS FACILITIES

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	None	$0
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$0

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment/Roof Replacement	$80,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$105,000

Note: all non-capacity projects to be funded from the Construction Fund

COUNTY SHERIFF FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The Sheriff Administrative Facilities were constructed in 2003 and early 2004 with occupancy occurring in April, 2004.

TABLE 12-CF-1A

SHERIFF'S ADMINISTRATION, INVESTIGATION, PATROL

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	Net Sq. Ft. Capacity
Administrative Facility	Port Hadlock	8,000
Clearwater Annex	Clearwater	4,072
	Total	12,072

COUNTY SHERIFF FACILITIES (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) will not require any additional space by the end of the planning period. No capacity projects are required. Since the Clearwater Annex is staffed by a single officer, it was not included in the Level Of Service (LOS) calculation.

TABLE 12-CF-2A

SHERIFF'S ADMINISTRATION, INVESTIGATION, PATROL

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
244.5
Square Feet Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Square Feet Per Capita	Square Feet Change	Available Square Feet	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		6,921		8,000	1,079
2006	28,815	504	7,045	124	8,000	955
2007	29,327	513	7,170	125	8,000	830
2008	29,844	522	7,297	127	8,000	703
2009	30,366	531	7,424	127	8,000	576
2010	30,892	540	7,553	129	8,000	447

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2007	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$0	0	0
		Total Proposed	8,000	447

COUNTY SHERIFF FACILITIES (continued)

TABLE 12-CF-3A

SHERIFF'S ADMINISTRATION, INVESTIGATION, PATROL

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	None	$0
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$0

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$30,000

Note: all non-capacity projects to be funded from the Construction Fund

COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of Justice Facilities includes a total of 20,367 square feet including Superior Court, District Court/Probation, Juvenile Services/Family Court, and the Prosecuting Attorney's offices.

TABLE 12-CJF-1

JUSTICE FACILITIES

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	Net Sq. Ft. Capacity
Jefferson County Courthouse	Port Townsend	
	Superior Court	8,846
	District Court/Probation	4,077
	Juvenile Services/Family Court	2,934
	Prosecuting Attorney	4,510
	Total	20,367

COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) will require a net additional 2,274 square feet of space by the end of the planning period. The deficit of 2,274 square feet will be addressed by relocating general administrative staff (non-justice related) to other County facilities, which will free additional space in the Courthouse. No capacity projects are required.

TABLE 12-CJF-2

JUSTICE FACILITIES

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
732.4
Square Feet Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Square Feet Per Capita	Square Feet Change	Available Square Feet	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		20,733		20,367	-366
2006	28,815	504	21,104	371	20,367	-737
2007	29,327	513	21,479	375	20,367	-1,112
2008	29,844	522	21,858	379	20,367	-1,491
2009	30,366	531	22,240	382	20,367	-1,873
2010	30,892	540	22,625	385	20,367	-2,258

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	Stop Renting DSHS Building	$0	2,274	2,274
2007	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$0	2,274	2,274
		Total Proposed	22,641	16

COUNTY JUSTICE FACILITIES (continued)

TABLE 12-CJF-3
JUSTICE FACILITIES

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

Proposed Projects		Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	None	$0
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$0

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

Proposed Projects		Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$30,000

Note: all non-capacity projects to be funded from the Construction Fund

COUNTY GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of County government administrative offices includes four County-owned facilities (Courthouse, Courthouse Storage Building, Castle Hill Building, and the DSHS Building) and one leased facility (Federal Building). The DSHS Building, which is approximately 8,000 square feet, is currently being rented to the State of Washington. Table 12-CAO-1 "Current Facilities Inventory", lists the facilities as well as the current building square footage and location.

TABLE 12-CGAO-1

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	Net Sq. Ft. Capacity
Jefferson County Courthouse	Port Townsend	
	Administrative Offices	15,420
	Storage Building	2,112
Castle Hill Building	Port Townsend	14,512
Federal Building (Leased)	Port Townsend	9,937
DSHS Building	Port Townsend	0
	Total	41,981

COUNTY GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) will require a net additional 4,657 square feet of space by the end of the planning period. Currently the DSHS Building is rented to a third party and is not used to house County staff; the deficit will be addressed by relocating general administrative staff (non-justice related) to other County facilities, which will free additional space in the Courthouse. No capacity projects are required. It is anticipated that additional space requirements will continue to be met, in part, through the use of leased space.

TABLE 12-CGAO-2

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
1,509.7
Square Feet Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Square Feet Per Capita	Square Feet Change	Available Square Feet	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		42,737		41,981	-756
2006	28,815	504	43,502	765	41,981	-1,521
2007	29,327	513	44,275	773	41,981	-2,294
2008	29,844	522	45,055	780	41,981	-3,074
2009	30,366	531	45,844	789	41,981	-3,863
2010	30,892	540	46,638	794	41,981	-4,657

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	Stop Renting DSHS Building (Total Sq Ft 8,000)	$0	5,726	5,726
2007	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$0	5,726	5,726
		Total Proposed	47,707	1,069

COUNTY GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES (continued)

TABLE 12-CGAO-3

GENERAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	None	$0
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$0

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$140,500
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$100,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$20,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$275,500

Note: all non-capacity projects to be funded from the Construction Fund

COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES

Current Facilities: The current inventory of County Maintenance Shop facilities totals 30,000 square feet, and includes five (5) County-owned facilities: Brinnon Storage/Shop, Clearwater Road Maintenance Shop, Quilcene Road Maintenance Shop, Hoh River Road Maintenance Shop, and the Port Hadlock Main Shop.

TABLE 12-MF-1

MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY		
Name	Location	Net Sq. Ft. Capacity
Brinnon Storage Shop	Brinnon	1,800
Clearwater Road Maintenance Shop	Clearwater	8,400
Quilcene Road Maintenance Shop	Quilcene	1,800
Hoh River Maintenance Shop	West End	6,000
Port Hadlock Main Shop	Port Hadlock	12,000
	Total	30,000

COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES (continued)

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level Of Service (LOS) will require a net additional 3,329 square feet of space by the end of the planning period. Replacement of the Quilcene Road Maintenance Shop will provide a net increase of 5,700 square feet in 2006 thus creating a surplus by the end of the planning period.

TABLE 12-MF-2

MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES

CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed Level Of Service Equals
1,078.9
Square Feet Per 1,000 population

Year	Service Area Population	Population Change	Square Feet Per Capita	Square Feet Change	Available Square Feet	Reserve or (Deficit)
2005	28,308		30,542		30,000	-542
2006	28,815	504	31,089	547	30,000	-1,089
2007	29,327	513	31,641	552	30,000	-1,641
2008	29,844	522	32,199	558	30,000	-2,199
2009	30,366	531	32,762	563	30,000	-2,762
2010	30,892	540	33,329	567	30,000	-3,329

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost	Proposed Square Feet	Change To Reserve Or (Deficit)
2005	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2006	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2007	Replace Quilcene Maintenance Shop	$250,000	5,700	5,700
2008	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2009	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
2010	No Projects Proposed	$0	0	0
	Total Projects	$250,000	5,700	5,700
		Total Proposed	35,700	2,371

COUNTY MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES (continued)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

TABLE 12-MF-3
MAINTENANCE SHOP FACILITIES

CAPACITY AND NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS
FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES & USES OF FUNDS

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	None	$0
2006	Replace Quilcene Shop	$250,000
2007	None	$0
2008	None	$0
2009	None	$0
2010	None	$0
	Total Projects	$250,000

NON-CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Projects	Estimated Project Cost
2005	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$140,500
2006	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$100,000
2007	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$20,000
2008	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2009	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
2010	Facilities Improvements/Equipment	$5,000
	Total Projects	$275,500

Note: all projects to be funded from the Equipment Rental & Replacement Fund

PARKS AND RECREATION

Current Facilities

The 2004 County-owned parks inventory includes 534.7 acres of parks and 16.2 miles of trails:

Table 12-11
Acres of County Owned Park

Type of Park	**Acres**
Regional Parks	422.8
Community Parks	48.3
Neighborhood Parks	5.5
Campgrounds	40.7
Undeveloped	17.4
TOTAL ACRES	534.7

TABLE 12-PR-1

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES

The inventory of the current Parks and Recreation Facilities includes the following:

Name	Capacity (Net Area)	Location

NOTE: The inventory of current parks and recreation facilities is contained in the 2002 Jefferson County Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan and the Non-Motorized Transportation and Recreational Trails Plan. In addition since the Plans were adopted, Jefferson County has added 1.3 miles to the Larry Scott Trail and acquired the 17.4 acre Irondale Beach Community Park.

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

TABLE 12-PR-2a

PARKS AND RECREATION: REGIONAL PARKS JEFFERSON COUNTY CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS County Proposed LOS = 11.5 Acres Per 1,000 Population					
Time Period	Service Area Population		Acres @ 0.01151 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005 Base year	28,308		325.80	422.80	97.00
2006 Growth		507	5.84	0.00	(5.84)
2007 Growth		512	5.89	0.00	(5.89)
2008 Growth		517	5.95	0.00	(5.95)
2009 Growth		522	6.01	0.00	(6.01)
2010 Growth		526	6.05	0.00	(6.05)
Total As Of 12/31/2010	30,892		355.54	422.80	67.26
CAPACITY PROJECTS					
Proposed Project				Proposed Acres Available	Change To Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005	None Proposed			0	0
2006	None Proposed			0	0
2007	None Proposed			0	0
2008	None Proposed			0	0
2009	None Proposed			0	0
2010	None Proposed			0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2010				422.80	67.26

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

TABLE 12-PR-2b

PARKS AND RECREATION: COMMUNITY PARKS JEFFERSON COUNTY CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS County Proposed LOS = 0.51 Acres Per 1,000 Population				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00051 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005 Base year	28,308	14.55	48.32	33.77
2006 Growth	507	0.26	0.00	(0.26)
2007 Growth	512	0.26	0.00	(0.26)
2008 Growth	517	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
2009 Growth	522	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
2010 Growth	526	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
Total As Of 12/31/2010	30,892	15.88	48.32	32.44
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Proposed Acres Available	Chang To Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005	None Proposed		0	0
2006	None Proposed		0	0
2007	None Proposed		0	0
2008	None Proposed		0	0
2009	None Proposed		0	0
2010	None Proposed		0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2010			48.32	32.44

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

TABLE 12-PR-2c

PARKS AND RECREATION: NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

JEFFERSON COUNTY

CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed LOS = 0.14 Acres Per 1,000 Population

Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00014 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005 Base year	28,308	3.99	5.50	1.51
2006 Growth	507	0.07	0.00	(0.07)
2007 Growth	512	0.07	0.00	(0.07)
2008 Growth	517	0.07	0.00	(0.07)
2009 Growth	522	0.07	0.00	(0.07)
2010 Growth	526	0.07	0.00	(0.07)
Total As Of 12/31/2010	30,892	4.36	5.50	1.14

CAPACITY PROJECTS

Proposed Project		Proposed Acres Available	Change To Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005	None Proposed	0	0
2006	None Proposed	0	0
2007	None Proposed	0	0
2008	None Proposed	0	0
2009	None Proposed	0	0
2010	None Proposed	0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2010		5.50	1.14

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

TABLE 12-PR-2d

PARKS AND RECREATION: TRAILS

JEFFERSON COUNTY

CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed LOS = 0.52 Miles Per 1,000 Population

Time Period	Service Area Population	0.00052 Miles Per Capita	Current Miles Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005 Base year	28,308	14.70	16.20	1.50
2006 Growth	507	0.26	0.00	(0.26)
2007 Growth	512	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
2008 Growth	517	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
2009 Growth	522	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
2010 Growth	526	0.27	0.00	(0.27)
Total As Of 12/31/2010	30,892	16.04	16.20	0.16

CAPACITY PROJECTS

	Proposed Project	Proposed Miles Available	Change To Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005	Larry Scott Trail	5.60	5.60
2006	None Proposed	0	0
2007	None Proposed	0	0
2008	None Proposed	0	0
2009	None Proposed	0	0
2010	None Proposed	0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2010		21.80	5.76

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

TABLE 12-PR-2f

PARKS AND RECREATION: CAMPGROUNDS

JEFFERSON COUNTY

CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS

County Proposed LOS = 1.3 Acres Per 1,000 Population

Time Period	Service Area Population	Acres @ 0.00130 Per Capita	Current Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005 Base year	28,308	36.83	40.70	3.87
2006 Growth	507	0.66	0.00	(0.66)
2007 Growth	512	0.67	0.00	(0.67)
2008 Growth	517	0.67	0.00	(0.67)
2009 Growth	522	0.68	0.00	(0.68)
2010 Growth	526	0.68	0.00	(0.68)
Total As Of 12/31/2010	30,892	40.19	40.70	0.51

CAPACITY PROJECTS

Proposed Project		Proposed Acres Available	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005	None Proposed	0	0
2006	None Proposed	0	0
2007	None Proposed	0	0
2008	None Proposed	0	0
2009	None Proposed	0	0
2010	None Proposed	0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2010		40.70	0.51

PARKS AND RECREATION (continued)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing

TABLE 12-PR-3

PARKS AND RECREATION FACILITIES CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS (All Amounts x $1,000 in 2004 dollars)	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
IAC Grant	343	0	191	0	0	0	534
Donations	25	0	0	0	0	0	25
Additional Grant Funding (SAFETEA)	368	0	191	0	0	0	559
Public Vote: Metropolitan Park District Levy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Vote: Park & Recreation District	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Sources of Funds	**736**	**0**	**382**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,118**
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
Larry Scott Trail							
Acquisition/Development (5.6 Miles)	736	0	382	0	0	0	1,118
Trail Subtotal	736	0	382	0	0	0	1,118
Projects Subtotal	**736**	**0**	**382**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,118**
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**

SOLID WASTE

Jefferson County is responsible for the management of solid waste generated within the County under the Washington Administrative Codes WAC 173-304, WAC 173-351 and WAC173-350. No solid waste is currently disposed at the closed County landfill located at the Solid Waste Management Facility outside Port Townsend on County Landfill Road. The County will continue to use commercial carriers to transport solid waste to other landfill sites and recycle processing facilities outside the County during the foreseeable future.

Presently, Jefferson County contracts with a private hauler to transport solid waste to a landfill site at Roosevelt, near Goldendale, Washington. The County and Skookum Environmental Services, a private not-for-profit company under contract with the County, manage processing of recyclable materials. The City of Port Townsend operates a biosolids-composting facility that uses yard and land-clearing waste.

Current Facilities: The current solid waste facilities owned by the County and used for waste disposal and recycling include: (1) a transfer station and weigh-scales at the solid waste management facility (SWMF) outside Port Townsend; (2) a drop-box site at Quilcene; (3) a moderate risk waste facility at the Port of Port Townsend industrial shipyard in Port Townsend; and (4) a recycle processing facility co-located with the transfer station. The County is also responsible for maintaining the closed landfill and lagoon areas at the SWMF. The County currently operates all but the recycle facility, whose operation is contracted to Skookum.

Other Facilities: A biosolids-composting facility owned and operated by the City of Port Townsend is located on a leased area at the SWMF. The County weighs and records the weight of incoming yard and land clearing waste at the County's weigh-scales as a service to the City.

Recycle Program: The County's recycling program includes three elements: (1) curbside residential recycling in the City of Port Townsend and the County, collected by private solid waste haulers; (2) commercial drop-box service provided to businesses by private solid waste haulers; and (3) the County owned recycling boxes at various collection sites in the County (the SWMF, Port of Port Townsend, Port Hadlock, Quilcene, Brinnon, and other sites determined by the County's recycling contractor, Skookum Environmental Services).

SOLID WASTE (continued)

TABLE 12-SW-1

CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY

SOLID WASTE FACILITIES

The inventory of the current Solid Waste Facilities includes the following:

Name	Capacity (Net Sq.Ft.)	Location
SW Transfer Station – Buildings	12,050	Co. Landfill Road, Jefferson County
SW TS - Working Lot Area	51,290	Co. Landfill Road, Jefferson County
Solid Waste Drop Box Facility	30,320	Highway 101, Quilcene
Recycle Center – Buildings	10,900	Co. Landfill Road, Jefferson County
Recycle Center - Working Lot Area	58,100	Co. Landfill Road, Jefferson County
Moderate Risk Waste Facility	8,202	Port of Port Townsend
Total Net Square Feet	170,862	
Solid Waste Management Facility		Co. Landfill Road, Jefferson County
Actively Operated/Maintained Areas	35 acres	
Buffer Area	66 acres	
Total SW Facility Area	101 acres	

Note 1: "Working lot area" is the working area surrounding the transfer station and recycle center buildings.
Note 2: "Active Areas" at the SWMF include the transfer station, recycle center, compost facility, closed landfill, and associated areas. "Buffer Area" is remainder with no current permitted operations.

SOLID WASTE (continued)

Capacity Needs and Requirements:

Level of Service (LOS): For solid waste the Level of Service (LOS) standard is driven by Health and Safety requirements as prescribed in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC) cited above. The solid waste system must be able to meet or exceed the quantity of solid waste generated and delivered to County facilities at all times. Utilities Element Table 11-5 shows the solid waste annual demand tonnage forecast for the planning period 2005 – 2010 and through to 2024. This forecast is determined by projecting annual recycle and transfer disposal tonnages based on recent years records and long term trends.

Table 12-7 compares the proposed Level of Service (LOS) standards for solid waste disposed and recycled for the planning period 2005 – 2010 with previously adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards. The proposed LOS standards are 5.0 pounds per person per day for all solid waste and a recycling goal of 16% through County facilities. The recycling goal is equivalent to a recycle LOS of 0.8 pounds per person per day in 2010 as a share of the overall Level of Service (LOS), the remainder 4.2 pounds per person per day being disposed solid waste. The solid waste Level of Service (LOS) standard does not include composting waste, as this waste material is not processed through County owned facilities.

LEVEL OF SERVICE (LOS) STANDARD

Facility	LOS Unit	1998 LOS Standard	CFP LOS Standard
Solid Waste – All Waste	Lbs./Person/Day	3.99 Lbs	5.0 Lbs
Solid Waste	Recycle Rate	14%	16%
Solid Waste – Garbage	Lbs./Person/Day	2.83 Lbs	4.2 Lbs
Solid Waste - Recycle	Lbs./Person/Day	0.56 Lbs	0.8 Lbs

The projections for 2024 are a Level of Service (LOS) of 5.6 pounds per person per day for all solid waste and a recycling goal of 18% or 1.01 pounds per person per day Level of Service (LOS), the remainder 4.59 pounds per person per day being disposed solid waste.

The proposed recycling percent goals in the long term are lower than the previous plan projections. However, the proposed recycled material Level of Service (LOS) in pounds per person per day is increasing at a higher rate than the previous plan projections. This reflects the expected lower rate of increase in the quantity of waste recycled compared to the quantity disposed, which reduces the calculated recycling rate.

SOLID WASTE (continued)

TABLE 12-SW-2

SOLID WASTE				
JEFFERSON COUNTY				
CAPITAL PROJECTS LOS CAPACITY ANALYSIS				
Proposed LOS Garbage only = 4.20 Lbs per Person per Day				
Proposed LOS Recycle only = 0.80 Lbs per Person per Day				
Time Period	Service Area Population	Tons @ 5.00 Lbs per Person per Day	Available Capacity Tons	Net Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005 Base	28,308	25,831	32,500	6,669
2006 Growth	507	463	0	(463)
2007 Growth	512	467	0	(467)
2008 Growth	517	472	0	(472)
2009 Growth	522	476	0	(476)
2010 Growth	526	480	0	(480)
Total As Of 12/31/2010	30,892	28,189	32,500	4,311
CAPACITY PROJECTS				
Proposed Project			Accessed Capacity Tons	Change To Reserve/ (Deficit)
2005	None Proposed		0	0
2006	Weigh/Scale System		33,500	33,500
2007	Road Construction		0	0
2008	None Proposed		0	0
2009	None Proposed		0	0
2010	None Proposed		0	0
Proposed Total by FY 2010			66,000	37,811

NOTES:

(1) Available capacity includes currently usable capacity of the Transfer Station and the Recycle Center

(2) The full design capacity will be limited by current access through the weigh-scales

(3) The proposed project will allow the full capacity to be accessed

SOLID WASTE (continued)

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: The County's solid waste program includes three capital project areas in the 6-year period 2005 - 2010 at a total estimated cost of $1,489,000. The proposed financing plan is shown on Table 12-SW-3.

The non-capacity solid waste facilities improvements and equipment project comprises planned replacements and additions needed to maintain the County's current transfer station operations. A part of these facilities improvements will likely involve in-bound/out-bound access improvements to reduce customer delays that will otherwise occur with the expected increase in vehicle traffic and total waste quantity through the weigh-scales. Refurbishing/upgrading of the weigh-scale facility and system itself is also planned to maintain cost-effective operations. A part of the transfer station improvement projects is also considered to have a capacity element, to install a commercial vehicle automatic weigh-scale system and bypass in 2006-2007, required to maintain the proposed solid waste LOS standard beyond 2010. The other solid waste facilities improvements and equipment are planned replacements and additions to solid waste facilities other than the transfer station.

TABLE 12-SW-3
SOLID WASTE
CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN
SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS
(All Amounts x $1,000)

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
Solid Waste Fund (Equipment Reserve)	354.00	457.00	159.00	68.00	231.00	120.00	1389.00
Road Fund			100.00				100.00
Total Sources of Funds	354.00	457.00	259.00	68.00	231.00	120.00	1489.00
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
Solid Waste Transfer Station							
Construction and Improvements	0.00	97.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	97.00
Road Construction	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
Total Capacity Projects	0.00	97.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	197.00
Non-Capacity Projects:							
Solid Waste Transfer Station:							
Facilities Improvements/Equipment	178.00	214.00	117.00	13.00	21.00	102.00	645.00
Other Solid Waste Management Facilities:							
Facilities Improvements/Equipment	176.00	146.00	42.00	55.00	210.00	18.00	647.00
Total Non Capacity Projects	354.00	360.00	159.00	68.00	231.00	120.00	1292.00
Total Capacity and Non Capacity Projects	354.00	457.00	259.00	68.00	231.00	120.00	1489.00
BALANCE SURPLUS OR (DEFICIT)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND FLOOD CONTROL FACILITIES

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

Existing Stormwater Management Facilities:
Most of the stormwater management facilities owned by Jefferson County serve County roads. In addition there are facilities to collect, treat, convey and dispose of stormwater runoff from County owned buildings, including the County road maintenance facility, Community Centers, Sheriff's office, and jail. There is also a storm sewer system in the area around the main intersection in Port Hadlock that collects runoff from Irondale Road, Chimacum Road, SR 116, and private properties and discharges it to Port Townsend Bay. This system does not have a treatment facility.

Stormwater Management Level of Service Standard (LOSS):
Jefferson County has adopted the standards of the Washington Department of Ecology Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington as its Level of Service Standard for designing stormwater management facilities. The County has also adopted the Washington State Department of Transportation Highway Runoff Manual as its Level of Service Standard for stormwater management facilities for County Roads.

Stormwater Management Capital Facility Projects and Financing:
Capital facility planning for County Roads, including stormwater management facilities, is conducted through the Six Year Transportation Improvement Plan.

The Port Hadlock Urban Growth Area (UGA) Stormwater Management Plan identifies the need for a water quality treatment facility for the Port Hadlock storm sewer system. The Plan recommends that the facility be added during the 2005-2010 planning period. It also anticipates that the system's outfall will need to be replaced during the period 2011-2024. The Plan recommends that these improvements be funded by a stormwater fee as provided for by the Revised Code of Washington (RCW 36). There are no other capacity related stormwater management projects identified for County facilities.

FLOOD CONTROL

Existing Flood Control Facilities:
There are several major watersheds within Jefferson County including the Duckabush, Dosewallips, and Big Quilcene Rivers in the East County and the Bogachiel, Hoh, Clearwater, Queets, and Quinault Rivers in the West End of the County. These rivers and other smaller streams experience periodic flood events that are related to natural features, including climate, geology, and topography. Human activity, including timber harvest and road construction, has increased the frequency and exacerbated the severity of these flood events. Public and private property in floodplains has been damaged by these events. Fish and shellfish habitat has also been impacted. However, with the exception of the Lower Big Quilcene River, which is discussed below, Jefferson County does not own flood control facilities.

Dikes were constructed along the lower reaches of the Big Quilcene River during the first half of the 20th Century that confine the river to a narrow channel. The river frequently overtops these dikes during flood events. This flooding has damaged public and private property and impacted fish and shellfish resources. Jefferson County has purchased some of the diked property as a component of its Lower Big Quilcene River flood hazard mitigation activities.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND FLOOD CONTROL FACILITIES (continued)

Flood Control Level of Service Standard (LOSS):
Jefferson County does have an adopted Level of Service Standard for flood control facilities. The County's preferred approach to flood management is to develop a comprehensive flood hazard program, rather than to simply construct or improve dikes to contain a specific flood event. The County does not anticipate setting a Flood Control LOSS.

Flood Control Capital Facilities Projects and Financing:
Jefferson County has developed the Lower Big Quilcene River Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan (1998). The Plan identifies potential flood hazard mitigation activities, including property purchases, dike removal and setback, and bridge reconstruction. These projects would reduce flood impacts by removing specific residential structures and increasing floodplain and floodway capacity. The County is currently conducting a detailed analysis of alternatives presented in the Plan. When this analysis is completed, the County will identify preferred alternatives and seek funding to conduct them. At that time the Capital Facility Element will be updated to include this information.

TABLE 12-SW-3

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT AND FLOOD CONTROL CFP PROJECTS AND FINANCING PLAN SOURCES AND USES OF FUNDS (All Amounts x $1,000 in 2004 dollars)	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	TOTAL
SOURCES OF FUNDS							
Stormwater Fees	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00
Total Funds	**0.00**	**10.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**10.00**
USES OF FUNDS							
Capacity Projects:							
Port Hadlock Storm Sewer Treatment Facility							
Construction	0.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.00
Projects Total	**0.00**	**10.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**10.00**
BALANCE	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**	**0.00**
Surplus or (Deficit)							

TRANSPORTATION

COUNTY ROADS

Current Facilities: The County Road inventory consists of 395.85 miles of County Roads: Major Collectors = 34.66 miles; Minor Collectors = 101.65 miles; Local Access = 249.12 miles; Urban Collectors = 1.54 miles; and Urban Access = 8.88 miles. There are also 26 County-owned bridges. This inventory does not include City of Port Townsend streets and State Highways.

TABLE 12-TR-1
CURRENT FACILITIES INVENTORY
COUNTY ROADS

The Jefferson County road Log is the official County Road inventory. Copies are available from the Jefferson County Public Works Department. Additional information is contained in the Transportation Element.

Level of Service (LOS): As discussed in the Transportation Element, complex data collection and mathematical formulas are used to determine Level of Service (LOS) for roadways. Roadway Level of Service is generally rated on a scale of "A" through "F". This is a qualitative measure that describes operational conditions within a traffic stream and takes into account factors such as speed, travel time, delay, comfort, and convenience. Level of Service (LOS) "A" through "C" signify free flowing traffic with minimal delays. Level of Service (LOS) "D" and "E" signify unstable traffic flow with significant delays. Level of Service (LOS) "F" signifies forced, unstable traffic flow with substantial delays.

The Transportation Element sets forth the following County Road Level of Service (LOS) standards:

- **Policy TRP 1.1:** Provide for a Level of Service "C", or better, for rural County Road facilities based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.
- **Policy TRP 1.2:** Provide for a Level of Service "D", or better, on all County Road facilities within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), the Port Ludlow Master Planned Resort, and Designated Tourist Corridors as established by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization, based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing
Capacity analysis conducted for the Transportation Element indicates that all County Roads are projected to meet the Level of Service (LOS) Standards for the period 2005 – 2024. No transportation capacity projects are planned in the Six Year Transportation Improvement Program 2005-2010. The Transportation Improvement Program plans expenditures of $8,273,000 on non-capacity transportation improvement projects during the planning period. Sources of funds, descriptions of planned projects, and a schedule of annual revenues, expenditures, and projects are listed in the Transportation Improvement Program. The Transportation Improvement Program is updated annually. Copies are available from the Jefferson County Public Works Department.

Concurrency (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): In compliance with the GMA and **CFP 3.1**, County Roads must meet the adopted Level of Service Standards concurrent with proposed development. Based on analysis conducted for the Transportation Element, no capacity-related capital projects are planned because all County Road facilities are projected to meet the Level of Service (LOS) Standards for the period 2005-2010.

TRANSPORTATION (continued)

TRANSIT

Current Facilities: Jefferson Transit operates an administrative, operational, and maintenance facility in Port Townsend.

Current Routes: Jefferson Transit operates four fixed routes that connect Port Townsend with communities in East Jefferson County, including the Tri-Area, Brinnon, Quilcene, and Port Ludlow, as well as Poulsbo, and Sequim. There are also three routes within the City of Port Townsend. Jefferson Transit also provides service to the West End of the County on a route that runs between Forks in Clallam County and Amanda Park in Grays Harbor County.

Level of Service (LOS): As discussed in the Transportation Element, Jefferson Transit's LOS Standard is to provide a minimum of 8,400 Annual Transit Revenue Service Hours (ATRSH). This is equivalent to 270 ATRSH per 1,000 County-wide population for fixed routes in Jefferson County for the projected 2010 population. In order to meet this Level of Service (LOS) standard for the projected 2024 population, Jefferson Transit would need to provide 10,918 ATRSH.

Concurrency (Adequate Public Facilities Criteria): Jefferson Transit currently meets its Level of Service (LOS) standard. No capacity projects will be necessary to meet this Level of Service (LOS) during the 2005-2010 planning period.

SEWAGE COLLECTION / TREATMENT

Current Facilities: The County currently does not own or operate sewage collection or treatment facilities. As a result of the recent addition of the Tri Area as a UGA, facility planning will be undertaken to determine the specific capacity needs, potential ownership and operations scenarios, and funding requirements.

Level of Service (LOS): The proposed Level of Service (LOS) will not be determined until a specific facility type is selected and appropriate studies are conducted to evaluate capacity and usage.

Capital Facilities Projects and Financing: Since the type of facility has not yet been determined, funding plans have not yet been developed.

Planning Levels of Service and Adequate Facilities: In compliance with the GMA and Capital Facilities Policy 3.2, adequate sewage treatment capacity is proposed within this Capital Facilities Element. The County is anticipating $300,000 (2004 dollars) in planning sewer facility planning costs to be incurred by the end of 2005.

CAPITAL FACILITIES PROJECTIONS: 2005 – 2024

This section estimates the long-term effect of population growth on the "capacity" during the 20 year period based on the current 'Level of Service" standard. The end-year estimates are shown for 2010, 2016, 2022, and 2024. The first planning period, 2010, is based on a capital improvement plan that assures that capacity is adequate. The other three planning periods are simply projections that do not incorporate a capital improvement plan. Any capacity deficiency shown in the last three cycles (2016,2020, & 2024) will be addressed during each six (6) year planning interval based on future population estimates, funding for the capital improvement plan, and/or modification of the "Level of Service" standard.

Table 12-20-A and 12-20-B, shown on the following pages, present information for each category of facilities.

CAPITAL FACILITIES PROJECTIONS: 2005 – 2024 (continued)

SUMMARY TWENTY YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS AND CAPACITY PROJECTIONS: 2005-2024

TABLE 12-20-A

	Level of Service Unit of Measure	2005 Units Available	2010 Units Available	Level of Service
Category A, Concurrent with Development				
Transportation				
Rural Roads	Levels A thru F	Note 1	Note 1	Level C
Urban Growth Areas (UGA)	Levels A thru F	Note 1	Note 1	Level D
Master Planned Resort (MPR)	Levels A thru F	Note 1	Note 1	Level D
Designated Tourist Corrider (DTC)	Levels A thru F	Note 1	Note 1	Level D
Category B, Level of Service Standard				
Animal Shelter	Sq Feet Per 1,000 Population	2,313.00	2,313.00	74.90
Community Centers	Sq Feet Per 1,000 Population	39,473.00	39,473.00	1,277.60
County Corrections Inmate Facilities	Beds Per 1,000 Population	58.00	58.00	1.90
County Sheriff Facilities	Sq Feet Per 1,000 Population	8,000.00	8,000.00	244.50
County Justice Facilities	Sq Feet Per 1,000 Population	20,367.00	22,641.00	732.40
County General Administrative Facilities	Sq Feet Per 1,000 Population	41,981.00	47,707.00	1,509.70
County Maintenance Shop Facilities	Sq Feet Per 1,000 Population	30,000.00	35,700.00	1,078.90
Parks & Recreation Facilities				
Regional Parks	Acres Per 1,000 Population	422.80	422.80	11.50
Community Parks	Acres Per 1,000 Population	48.32	48.32	0.51
Neighborhood Parks	Acres Per 1,000 Population	5.50	5.50	0.14
Trails	Miles Per 1,000 Population	16.20	21.80	0.52
Campgrounds	Acres Per 1,000 Population	40.70	40.70	1.30
Solid Waste Facilities	Pounds Per Person Per Day	32,500 Tons	66,000 Tons	5.00
Stormwater Facilities				
Stormwater Management	Based on Ordinance	Pending	Pending	Note 2
Flood Control Facilities	Based on Ordinance	Pending	Pending	Pending
Sewer System Facilities	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending

Notes:

1. The County Public Works department maintains a County Road Inventory; that inventory does not include the Streets in the City of Port Townsend or State Highways.
2. The County has adopted standards from the Washington Department of Ecology "Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington"

CAPITAL FACILITIES PROJECTIONS: 2005 – 2024 (continued)

SUMMARY TWENTY YEAR INFRASTRUCTURE NEEDS AND CAPACITY PROJECTIONS: 2005-2024

TABLE 12-20-B

	Capacity Available/Deficiency (-)			
	2010	2016	2022	2024
Population Projected	30,892	34,748	38,809	40,139
Category A, Concurrent with Development				
Transportation				
Rural Roads	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency
Urban Growth Areas (UGA)	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency
Master Planned Resort (MPR)	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency
Designated Tourist Corrider (DTC)	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency	No Deficiency
Category B, Level of Service Standard				
Animal Shelter	-1	-290	-594	-693
Community Centers	5	-4,921	-10,109	-11,809
County Corrections Inmate Facilities	-1	-8	-16	-18
County Sheriff Facilities	447	-496	-1,489	-1,814
County Justice Facilities	16	-2,808	-5,783	-6,757
County General Administrative Facilities	1,069	-4,752	-10,883	-12,891
County Maintenance Shop Facilities	2,371	-1,790	-6,171	-7,606
Parks & Recreation Facilities				
Regional Parks	68	23	-24	-39
Community Parks	33	31	29	28
Neighborhood Parks	1	1	0	0
Trails	6	4	2	1
Campgrounds	1	-4	-10	-11
Solid Waste Facilities	37,811	34,292	30,587	29,373
Stormwater Facilities				
Stormwater Management	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending
Flood Control Facilities	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending
Sewer System Facilities	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending

1. The County Public Works department maintains a County Road Inventory; that inventory does not include the Streets in the City of Port Townsend or State Highways.
2. The County has adopted standards from the Washington Department of Ecology "Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington"

GOALS AND POLICIES

NARRATIVE: The Capital Facilities Element unites all the elements of this Comprehensive Plan. The function of the Capital Facilities Element is to establish a viable planning link between inventory, Level of Service, and financing for future public facilities. The goals state the general growth management intentions of the County. The policies are guidelines for decisions on how goals will be achieved. Strategies describe specific programs or actions to implement policies.

GOAL:

CFG 1.0 ~~To e~~ **Establish appropriate Level of Service standards for public facilities.**

POLICIES:

CFP 1.1 Levels of Service for Public Facilities: Establish the following Level of Service standards for categories of public facilities and apply the standards as follows:

Category A ~~**public facilities** are the following~~**Public Facilities** are the public facilities owned or operated by Jefferson County ~~that are~~ subject to concurrency.

Category A Level ~~**of Service standards:**~~**Of Service Standards:**

R~~**oads**~~ural, Urban, Master Planned Resort, and Designated Tourist Road Facilities: Maintain Level of Service standard C or better for rural road facilities based upon Average Annual Daily Trips. Maintain Level of Service standard D or better on all road facilities within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), Master Planned Resorts, and Designated Tourist Corridors as established by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO), based upon Average Annual Daily Trips.

Apply Category A Level of Service standards to development approvals issued by Jefferson County after adoption date of this Comprehensive Plan. Category A Level of Service standards will guide the County's capital budget and capital improvements program beginning with the 2005 fiscal year.

GOALS AND POLICIES (continued)

Category B ~~**public facilities** are the following~~**Public Facilities** are the public facilities owned or operated by Jefferson County subject to ~~planning Levels of Service~~Level of Service (LOS)standards.

Category B Level ~~of Service standards:~~Of Service Standards:

Animal Control Shelter	74.9 square feet per 1,000 pop.
Community Centers	1,277.6 square feet per 1,000 pop.
Corrections Inmate Facilities	1.90 beds per 1,000 pop.
County Sheriff Facilities	244.5 square feet per 1,000 pop.
~~Administrative Space:~~	~~656 square feet per 1,000 pop.~~
County Justice Facilities	732.4 square feet per 1,000 pop.
~~Administrative Offices (General Gov't):~~	~~2,85~~County General Administrative Facilities 1,509.7 square feet per 1,000 pop.
~~Administrative Offices (Sheriff):~~	~~656~~County Maintenance Shop Facilities 1,078.9 square feet per 1,000 pop.
~~Courts:~~	
~~District Court:~~	~~0.043 courtrooms per 1,000 pop.~~
~~Superior Court:~~	~~0.043 courtrooms per 1,000 pop.~~
Regional Parks	11.5 acres per 1,000 pop.
Community Parks	0.51 acres per 1,000 pop.
Neighborhood Parks	0.14 acres per 1,000 pop.
Trails	0.52 miles per 1,000 pop.
Campgrounds	1.3 acres per 1,000 pop.
~~Solid Waste:~~	
~~Disposal:~~	~~3.99~~Solid Waste, Garbage 4.20 pounds per capita per day
Solid Waste, Recycle	0.80 pounds per capita per day
Stormwater Management Facilities	Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington
Water System Facilities	Pending
Sewer Systems	Pending

Category B Level of Service standards will guide the County's capital budget decisions including the capital improvements program beginning with the 2005 fiscal year.

Category C ~~public f~~Public Facilities are the following facilities owned or operated by the Federal or State government, independent districts, the City of Port Townsend (outside the incorporated limits), and private entities.

Category C Level ~~of service standards:~~Of Service Standards:

Roads: Maintain Level of Service (LOS) C or better for rural road facilities based upon Average Annual Daily Trips. Maintain Level of Service (LOS) D or better based upon Average Annual Daily Trips on all road facilities within Urban Growth Areas (UGAs), Master Planned Resorts, and Designated Tourist Corridors as established by the Peninsula Regional Transportation Planning Organization (PRTPO)

Sanitary Sewer:

City of Port Townsend:	260 gallons per day/ERU
Port Ludlow (Ludlow Water Co., Inc.):	230 gallons per day/ERU

Water:

City of Port Townsend:	840 gallons per day/ERU
Port Ludlow (Ludlow Water Co. ,Inc.):	160 gallons per day/ERU
PUD No.1:	200 gallons per day/ERU
Tri-Area (City of Port Townsend):	800 gallons per day/ERU

Airport:
Jefferson County International Airport: Airport capacity equals 100% of aircraft operations demand.

GOALS AND POLICIES (continued)

Fire and Emergency Medical Services:

Fire District 1(Chimacum):	0.863 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 0.31 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Fire District 2 (Quilcene):	4.1 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 1.4 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Fire District 3 (Port Ludlow):	1.25 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 0.5 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Fire District 4 (Brinnon):	1.25 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 0.5 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Fire District 5 (Gardiner):	3.0 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 3.0 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Fire District 6 (Cape George):	0.67 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 0.29 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Fire District 7 (Clearwater):	2.0 fire units in service per 1,000 pop. 0 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.
Port Townsend Fire Department:	0.29 EMS units in service per 1,000 pop.

Hospital:

Jefferson General Hospital:	1.3 beds per 1,000 population

Library:

Jefferson Co. Rural Library District. 1:	433 square feet per 1,000 population

School District facilities:

Brinnon School District 46:	K-8: Not to exceed 23 students/classroom
Chimacum School District 49:	K-12: Not to exceed 27 students/classroom
Port Townsend School District 50:	K-3: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Port Townsend School District 50:	4-6: Not to exceed 30 students/classroom
Port Townsend School District 50:	7-12: Not to exceed 34 students/classroom
Queets/Clearwater School Dist.20:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Quilcene School District 48:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Quillayute School District 402:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom
Sequim School District 323:	K-12: Not to exceed 26 students/classroom

Transit:

Jefferson Transit:	~~8,400~~472 Annual Transit Revenue Service Hour (ATRSH)/1000 pop.

~~**Misc.:**~~

Misc.:

In addition to the LOS standards outlined above, the policies of the Land Use, Rural, and Utilities Elements relating to the development and financing of public facilities in rural and urban areas constitute additional Level of Service standards in accordance with the County-wide Planning Policies.

Category C standards guide the capital budget decisions and the capital improvements programs of the appropriate entities.

GOALS AND POLICIES (continued)

CFP 1.2 Urban and Rural Levels of Service: Jefferson County may create different Level of Service standards for Urban Growth Areas and rural areas of the County.

CFP 1.3 Level of Service Standards in Unincorporated UGAs: Level of service standards for public facilities in the unincorporated portion of Urban Growth Areas are the same as the County's adopted standards.

GOALS AND POLICIES (continued)

GOAL:

CFG 2.0 ~~To~~**Implement a Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan that ensures that County-owned public facilities meet the established Levels of Service.**

POLICIES:

CFP 2.1 Determining Public Facility Needs: Determine the quantity of capital improvements that are needed to eliminate existing deficiencies and to maintain the Level of Service standards for Category A and B public facilities.

CFP 2.2 Priorities: Establish priorities among capital improvements projects through amendments to the Capital Facilities Element and the County's Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept and Transportation Improvement Plans.

CFP 2.3 Financial Feasibility: Ensure that the estimated cost of all capital improvements does not exceed a conservative estimate of available revenues. A conservative estimate need not be the lowest estimate, but does not exceed the most likely estimate. It does not include revenues that require approval by a referendum, if that referendum has been rejected.

CFP 2.4 Budget Appropriation for Capital Improvements: Include an appropriation in the annual budget for all of the capital improvement projects listed in the Capital Facilities Element for that year. Omit from the budget capital improvements for which there is a binding agreement with another party to fund those capital improvements in the same fiscal year.

CFP 2.5 Monitoring: Monitor the implementation of the capital improvement program and development to ensure that the Land Use, Transportation, and Capital Facilities Elements are coordinated and consistent, and that established Level of Service standards for public facilities are achieved.

CFP 2.6 Financing Policies: Finance capital improvements and manage debt consistent with Capital Improvement Plans and the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

CFP 2.7 Operating and Maintenance Costs: Provide public facilities or accept their provision by other entities only if Jefferson County or the other entity is able to pay for subsequent operating and maintenance costs.

CFP 2.8 Revenues Requiring Referendum: Revise the Level of Service standard for a public facility if either revenue for capital improvements for that facility requires approval by referendum and a referendum has not been held, or a referendum was held and did not meet the approval of the public.

CFP 2.9 Financial Responsibility: Determine through a public process how to apportion the fair share of funding capital improvements for County-owned public facilities between existing and future developments.

CFP 2.10 Contingent Revenue: Condition approval of private developments that require public facility capital improvements, which will be financed by contingent sources of revenue, upon acquisition of that revenue. An example of a contingent source of revenue is debt that requires approval by a referendum. Make provision in the approval conditions for substituting a comparable amount of existing revenue if the contingent funding sources are not approved.

GOALS AND POLICIES (continued)

GOAL:

CFG 3.0 ~~To~~**Ensure that public facilities are adequate to support proposed development at the adopted Levels of Service.**

POLICIES:

CFP 3.1 Adequate Public Facility Concurrency: Issue development approvals only after a determination has been made that there is sufficient capacity of Category A public facilities to meet the Level of Service standards for existing and proposed development concurrent with the proposed development.

CFP 3.2 Planning Levels of Service: If the Level of Service standards for Category B or C public facilities are not achieved, the funding will either be increased to achieve the Level of Service Standard, or the Level of Service Standard will be modified through amendment to the Plan, and/or other Comprehensive Plan Elements will be amended.

CFP 3.3 Urban Growth Area Tiers: Designate "tiers" within designated Urban Growth Areas to discourage urban sprawl and leapfrog development and to encourage development of adequate public facilities and services concurrent with development as follows:

First Tier: Includes existing commercial centers and urbanized areas for which the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan provides urban services and facilities.

Second Tier: Areas for which urban services and facilities are planned for years 7-20 of the 20-year planning period. Urban services and facilities will be provided by the developer concurrent with development, or by public providers by implementing all or a portion of an approved capital facilities plan.

CFP 3.4 Financing: Providers of public facilities may require users of those facilities to pay for a portion of their cost and/or may require new development to pay impact fees, capacity fees, system distribution charges, special assessments, and/or mitigation payments allowed by law.

CFP 3.5 Reserving Public Facility Capacity: Reserve public facility capacity for vested development approvals that were issued prior to the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan.

GOALS AND POLICIES (continued)

GOAL:

CFG 4.0 ~~To~~**Ensure that all capital improvements are made in conformance with the goals and policies of the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.**

POLICIES:

CFP 4.1 Consistency: Locate all Category A and B public facility capital improvements in conformance with the adopted land use map and the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan.

CFP 4.2 Integration and Implementation: Integrate land use planning and decisions with planning and decisions for public facility capital improvements.

GOAL:

CFG 5.0 ~~To~~**Implement interlocal agreements with municipalities and other entities to coordinate efficient provision of public facilities consistent with the Capital Facilities Element.**

POLICIES:

CFP 5.1 Planning Coordination: Establish inter-local or joint planning agreements with municipalities and other providers of public facilities to coordinate planning for and development of Urban Growth Areas.

CFP 5.2 Fiscal Coordination: Coordinate funding of public facilities, including tax revenue sharing, the provision of regional services, and annexations through the development of interlocal agreements.

STRATEGIES

Jefferson County will use the following strategies for implementing the Capital Facilities Element. These strategies are both action items and detailed guidance for developing implementing ordinances and the County's Capital Improvement Program.

A. Strategy for Determining Quantities and Priorities for Capital Improvement Projects
B. Strategy to Finance the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan and Manage Debt
C. Strategy to Review and Update the Capital Facilities Element
D. Strategy to Ensure Adequate Public Facility Capacity Concurrent with Development
E. Strategy for Monitoring Adequate Public Facility Capacity Concurrent with Development

A. STRATEGY FOR DETERMINING QUANTITIES AND PRIORITIES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Jefferson County will use the following strategies to determine the quantity and types of capital improvements and to set priorities for capital improvements.

1. The quantity of capital improvements needed to eliminate existing deficiencies and to meet future demand will be determined for each public facility using the following calculation:

$$Q = (S \times D) - I$$

where Q is the quantity of capital improvements needed, S is the Level of Service standard, D is the demand (such as the population), and I is the inventory of existing facilities. The estimates of demand will account for demand that is likely to occur from previously issued development approvals as well as future growth. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0)

2. The Level of Service standards will not determine the need for a capital improvement in the following circumstances:

   A. Repair, remodeling, renovation, and replacement of obsolete or worn out facilities; or
   B. Capital improvements that provide Levels of Service in excess of the standards adopted in the Comprehensive Plan provided the following conditions are met:
      1) The capital improvement does not make financially infeasible any other capital improvement that is needed to achieve or maintain the Level of Service standards adopted in this Comprehensive Plan, and
      2) The capital improvement does not contradict, limit or substantially change the goals and policies of any element of this Comprehensive Plan, and
      3) One of the following conditions is met:
         a. The excess capacity is an integral part of a capital improvement that is needed to achieve or maintain Level of Service standards (i.e., the minimum capacity of a capital project is larger than the capacity required to provide the Level of Service); or
         b. The excess capacity provides economies of scale making it less expensive than a comparable amount of capacity if acquired at a later date; or
         c. The asset acquired is land that is environmentally sensitive or designated by Jefferson County as necessary for conservation or recreation; or
         d. The excess capacity is part of a capital project financed by general obligation bonds approved by referendum. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0)

A. STRATEGY FOR DETERMINING QUANTITIES AND PRIORITIES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (continued)

3. All facilities scheduled for construction or improvement in accordance with this strategy will be evaluated to identify any plans by State or local governments or districts that affect, or will be affected by, the proposed County capital improvement. Project evaluation may also involve additional criteria that are unique to each type of public facility, as described in other elements of this Comprehensive Plan. (Corresponding Goal: CFG 5.0)

4. The priorities for capital improvements among types of public facilities were established during the development of the Capital Facilities Element by adjusting the Level of Service standards and the available revenues until the resulting public facilities became financially feasible. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0)

5. Jefferson County will direct its capital improvements within types of public facilities to:

   A. Address current deficiencies;
   B. Provide new or expanded capital facilities and services currently enjoyed by County residents;
   C. Eliminate actual or potential threats to public health and safety; and
   D. Retain the attractiveness of Urban Growth Areas as suitable for new residential development. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

6. The priorities for capital improvements within a type of County-owned public facility will be in the following order:

   A. Reconstruction, rehabilitation, remodeling, renovation, or replacement of obsolete or worn out facilities that contribute to achieving or maintaining adopted Level of Service standards.
   B. New or expanded facilities that reduce or eliminate deficiencies in Levels of Service for existing demand. Expenditures in this category include equipment, furnishings, and other improvements necessary for the completion of a public facility.
   C. New facilities and improvements to existing public facilities that eliminate public hazards.
   D. New or expanded facilities that provide the adopted Levels of Service for new development and redevelopment during the next six fiscal years.
   E. New facilities that exceed the adopted Levels of Service for new growth during the next six fiscal years by providing either:
      1) Excess public facility capacity that is needed by future growth beyond the next six years; or
      2) Higher quality public facilities than are contemplated in the County's normal design criteria for such facilities.
   F. Facilities not described in the above priorities, but which Jefferson County is obligated to complete, provided that such obligation is evidenced by a written agreement the County executed prior to the adoption of this Comprehensive Plan. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

A. STRATEGY FOR DETERMINING QUANTITIES AND PRIORITIES FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS (continued)

7. In the event that the planned capacity within a type of County-owned public facility is insufficient to serve all proposed development and redevelopment, capital improvements for new and expanded public facilities of that type will be scheduled in the following order of priority to serve:

   A Previously approved redevelopment,
   B. Previously approved development,
   C. New approved redevelopment, and
   D. New approved new development.
   (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

8. The County may acquire land or right-of-way in advance of the need to develop a public facility. (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

STRATEGIES (continued)

B. STRATEGY TO FINANCE SIX-YEAR CAPITAL FACILITIES CONCEPT PLAN AND MANAGE DEBT

Jefferson County will use the following strategies to finance capital improvements and fund debt, including financing debt, funding excess capacity, adjusting for rejected referenda, and apportioning the cost of capital improvements between existing and future development.

1. Capital improvements financed by County enterprise funds (i.e., solid waste) will be financed by:

   A. Debt repaid by user fees, charges, and excise taxes, and/or connection or capacity fees for enterprise services; or
   B. Current assets (i.e., reserves, equity or surpluses, and current revenue, including grants, loans, donations and interlocal agreements); or
   C. Formation of a taxing district; or
   D. A combination of debt, current assets, and taxes.
   (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

2. Capital improvements financed by non-enterprise funds will be financed by:

   A. Current assets (i.e., current revenue, fund equity and reserves), or
   B. Debt, or
   C. A combination of debt and current assets.
   (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

3. Financing decisions will consider which funding source will be:

   A. Most cost effective,
   B. Consistent with prudent asset and liability management,
   C. Appropriate to the useful life of the project(s) to be financed, and
   D. The most efficient use of the County's ability to borrow funds.
   (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

B. STRATEGY TO FINANCE SIX-YEAR CAPITAL FACILITIES CONCEPT PLAN AND MANAGE DEBT (continued)

4. Debt financing will not be used to provide more capacity than is needed within the schedule of capital improvements for non-enterprise public facilities unless the excess capacity:

   A. Is an integral part of a capital improvement that is needed to achieve or maintain Level of Service standards (i.e., the minimum capacity of a capital improvement is larger than the capacity required to provide the Level of Service); or
   B. Provides economies of scale, making it less expensive than a comparable amount of capacity if acquired at a later date; or
   C. Is land that is environmentally sensitive or designated by the County as necessary for conservation or recreation; or
   D. Is part of a capital project financed by general obligation bonds approved by referendum. (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

5. When a referendum, which is intended to finance capital improvements, is unsuccessful, adjustments for lack of revenues may include, but are not limited to, the following:

   A. Reduce the Level of Service for one or more public facilities;
   B. Increase the use of other sources of revenue;
   C. Decrease the demand for and subsequent use of capital facilities; or
   D. A combination of the above alternatives.
   (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

6. The Board of Commissioners will determine whether impact fees, as allowed by law, are necessary to maintain Level of Service standards. If adopted, impact fee ordinances will require the same Level of Service standard as is required by Capital Facilities Policy 1.1 and may include standards for other types of public facilities not addressed under Capital Facilities Policy 1.1. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

7. Payments by existing development to fund capital improvements may take the form of user fees, charges for services, special assessments and taxes. Payments by future development to fund capital improvements may take the form of, but are not limited to, voluntary contributions for the benefit of any public facility, impact fees, mitigation payments, capacity fees, dedications of land, provision of public facilities, and future payments of user fees, charges for services, special assessments, and taxes. Future development will not pay impact fees for capital improvements to any public facility that reduces or eliminates existing deficiencies. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

8. Both existing and future development may have part of their costs paid by grant entitlements or public facilities from other levels of government and independent districts. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 4.0, 5.0)

STRATEGIES (continued)

C. STRATEGY TO REVIEW AND UPDATE THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

The following strategy provides guidance for updating the Capital Facilities Element, for funding scheduled capital improvements, for monitoring implementation of the Capital Facilities Element, and for making minor corrections and modifications to the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan.

1. The Capital Facilities Element will be reviewed and updated regularly in conjunction with the County budget process and the release of the official population estimates and projections by the Office of Financial Management of the State of Washington. The update will include the following:

   A. Revise population projections;
   B. Update inventory of public facilities;
   C. Update cost of providing public facilities;
   D. Review the Level of Service Standards;
   E. Update capacity of public facilities (actual Levels of Service compared to adopted standards);
   F. Update revenue forecasts;
   G. Revise and develop capital improvement projects for the next six years;
   H. Update analysis of financial capacity;
   I. Amend the Capital Facilities Element, including amendments to the Level of Service standards, capital projects, and/or the financing plan sources of revenue. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

2. Jefferson County's annual budget will include capital appropriations for all projects identified in the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan that are necessary to maintain the Level of Service standards during that fiscal year. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 4.0)

3. Jefferson County will prepare regular evaluation reports to monitor the implementation of the goals and policies of the Capital Facilities Element. The evaluation will include:

   A. Regular reports of the Concurrency Implementation and Monitoring System.
   B. Regular updates of the Capital Facilities Element, including updated supporting documents as appropriate. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

1. The Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan may be adjusted by ordinance not deemed to be an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan for corrections, updates, and modifications concerning costs; revenue sources; acceptance of facilities pursuant to dedications which are consistent with the Element; non-capacity projects which do not affect scheduling of capacity projects; or the date of construction (so long as it is completed within the 6-year period). (Corresponding Goal: CFG 4.0)

STRATEGIES (continued)

D. STRATEGY TO ENSURE ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITY CAPACITY CONCURRENT WITH DEVELOPMENT

The following strategy provides guidance for developing implementing ordinances, including an ordinance to determine if there is adequate public facility capacity concurrent with development.

1. Jefferson County will adopt an ordinance, which will establish policies and procedures for determining if there is adequate public facility capacity concurrent with development.

2. For all public facilities, except roads, in order to determine that capacity is available to serve development:

   A. The facilities will be in place when a development approval is issued; or
   B. The facilities will be under construction at the time a development approval is issued and will be in place when the impacts of the development occur; or
   C. Development approvals may be issued subject to the condition that the facilities will be in place when the impacts of the development occur. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)

3. For Rural and Designated Tourist Road Facilities, in order to determine that capacity is available to serve development:

   A. Any of the three provisions listed in Strategy D.1. may apply; or
   B. The County will have in place a binding financial commitment to provide the capacity within six years. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)

4. Jefferson County will issue preliminary development approvals which are subject to concurrency if the applicant complies with one of the following:

   A. The applicant receives a determination of the capacity of Category A public facilities as part of preliminary development review and approval; or
   B. The applicant requests preliminary development approval without a determination of capacity of Category A public facilities, provided that any such approval is issued subject to requirements in the applicable land development regulation or to specific conditions contained in the preliminary development approval that:
      1) Final development approval for the subject property is subject to a determination of capacity of Category A public facilities, and
      2) Neither rights to obtain final development approval nor any other rights to develop the subject property have been granted or implied by the County's preliminary development approval without determining the capacity of public facilities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)

D. STRATEGY TO ENSURE ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITY CAPACITY CONCURRENT WITH DEVELOPMENT (continued)

5. The following conditions will apply to development approvals subject to concurrency:

A. The determination that facility capacity is available will apply to specific uses, densities and intensities based on information provided by the applicant and included in the development approval.
B. The determination of public facility capacity and the validity of the capacity for the same period of time as the development approval, including any extensions. If the development approval does not have an expiration date, the capacity will be valid for a period not to exceed two years.

6. County Development Regulations will address the circumstances under which public facilities may be provided by applicants for development approvals at the applicant's own expense in order to ensure sufficient capacity of public facilities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

7. Development applications, which require the provision of public facilities by the applicant, may be approved subject to the following:

   A. Jefferson County and the applicant enter into an enforceable development agreement which will provide, at a minimum, a schedule for construction of the public facilities and mechanisms for monitoring to ensure that the public facilities are completed concurrent with the impacts of the development, or that the development will not be allowed to proceed.

   B. The public facilities to be provided by the applicant may be contained in the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan of the Capital Facilities Element, and will achieve and maintain the adopted Level of Service standards. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

8. Jefferson County will adopt policies and procedures for reserving capacity of public facilities needed to serve vested development approvals. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

9. Jefferson County will reserve capacity of public facilities in order to serve approved development at the adopted Level of Service standard. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)

10. In the event that there is not sufficient capacity to serve the development which would use future public facility capacity, Jefferson County will develop criteria for determining which applications will be deferred to a future fiscal year because of insufficient capacity of public facilities during the current fiscal year. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 3.0)

STRATEGIES (continued)

E. STRATEGY FOR MONITORING ADEQUATE PUBLIC FACILITY CAPACITY CONCURRENT WITH DEVELOPMENT

The following strategy provides guidance for a monitoring system.

1. Jefferson County will establish and maintain a regular Monitoring System which will include the following components:

   A. A regular report on the capacity and Levels of Service of public facilities,
   B. A review of public facility capacity for development applications,
   C. A review of changes to planned capacity of public facilities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 4.0)

2. Report on the Capacity and Levels of Service of Public Facilities: This report will summarize the actual capacity of public facilities compared to the Level of Service standards adopted in the Capital Facilities Element. The report will also forecast the capacity of public facilities for each of the six succeeding fiscal years. The forecast will be based on the most current schedule of capital improvements in the Six-Year Capital Facilities Concept Plan. The report will provide the initial determination of the capacity and Levels of Service of public facilities for reviewing development permit applications during the following 12 months. Each application will be analyzed separately for concurrency, as described below. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 3.0, 4.0)

3. Public Facility Capacity Review of Development Applications: Jefferson County will review applications for developments in the unincorporated areas of the County to determine whether there is adequate capacity of public facilities concurrent with development. Records of all development approvals will be kept to indicate the cumulative impacts on the capacity of public facilities.

   Review will be conducted according to the terms of interlocal agreement(s) between the County and municipalities. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 2.0, 3.0)

4. Review of Changes to Planned Capacity of Public Facilities: Jefferson County will review each amendment to this Capital Facilities Element in order to ensure that the schedule of capital improvements is adequate to maintain the established Level of Service standards. (Corresponding Goals: CFG 1.0, 2.0, 4.0).

APPENDIX 2

JEFFRSON COUNTY CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT

COUNTY-WIDE PLANNING POLICY

The County-wide Planning Policy establishes a policy framework to guide the development of the Comprehensive Plan and development regulations while ensuring locally-determined consistency with the provisions of the Growth Management Act. The following table summarizes the capital facilities issues identified and addressed by the County-wide Planning Policy and their analysis in relation to the capital facility strategy of the plan:

County-wide Planning Policy		**Analysis**
# 1	Implement RCW 36.70A.110 Urban Growth Areas (UGAs)	Population forecasts will be used to prepare capital facilities plans. Designation and expansion of UGAs should be based on the capacity to provide public capital facilities at adopted Levels of Service.
# 2	Promotion of contiguous and orderly development and provision of urban services	The capital facilities element will define the Levels of Service for public facilities within UGAs. New development will meet the Level of Service (LOS) as a condition of approval and will contribute its proportionate share towards provision of those facilities. Urban public facilities will not be extended beyond UGA boundaries.
# 3	Joint County and City planning within Urban Growth Areas	The County and incorporated UGAs will coordinate plans for provision of County-wide capital facilities for public safety, transportation, solid waste, storm water management, and utilities.
# 4	Siting essential public facilities of County or State-wide significance	Essential public facilities sited outside of UGAs should not require the extension of urban public facilities.
# 5	County-wide transportation facilities and strategies	Guides development of the County's Six-Year Transportation Improvement Plan. Requires development of Level of Service standards. Although not specifically stated in the policy, these issues need to be coordinated with the Capital Facilities Element.
#7	County-wide economic development and employment	The Economic Development Plan shall be coordinated with the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
# 8	Rural Areas	Land use within rural centers will include public facilities necessary to support the center.
# 9	Fiscal impact analysis	A fiscal impact analysis will be conducted to ensure that the projected cost of public capital facilities can be reasonably supported.