



MASTER PLANNED RESORT

**PLEASANT HARBOR**  
-MARINA AND GOLF RESORT-  
**DRAFT**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT**

Jefferson County Department of  
Community Development  
September 5, 2007



# INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Statement addresses a proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment and master plan approval proposed as a future project to be located in Jefferson County and to be known as the Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort. The EIS is prepared to allow Jefferson County and its citizens to review the plan amendment and master plan, its purpose and need, the affected environment, the range of alternatives, and an analysis of environmental impacts and potential mitigation. A Master Planned Resort (MPR) is a change from rural to urban uses which may be approved in a rural area under the guidelines of the Washington State Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.365; the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan, Chapter 3, Long-range Goal 24, and Policies 24-1-13; and the Brinnon Subarea Plan, which had previously identified the Pleasant Harbor-Black Point area as a potential location for a Master Planned Resort (2002).

The Brinnon Subarea Plan (BSAP) specifically considered potential uses for the 310.6 acres at the Black Point Pleasant Harbor area south of Brinnon, encompassed within a designated “potential” master planned resort area, including a resort with an 18-hole golf course, clubhouse facilities, and hotel/inn with conference center, health, athletic facilities “with on-site advanced stormwater and wastewater treatment systems” and the “infill” of associated visitor supported commercial, recreational and residential uses associated with the marina and a Master Planned Resort.

The Statesman Pleasant Harbor proposed resort area encompasses approximately 256 acres within the MPR potential area identified in the Brinnon Subarea. The proposal specifically includes an updated and expanded commercial center for the marina, golf course, and resort housing, including residential, restaurant, spa, hotel managed facilities, targeted to both long-term and short-term tourist facilities. The proposed resort is served by onsite advanced stormwater and wastewater treatment systems specifically contemplated in the Subarea Plan to protect community environmental values and particularly water quality in Hood Canal.

The Master Planned Resort approval process and criteria are detailed in the Jefferson County Code, JCC 18.15.115 – 18.15.135, with the requirements for approval by the Planning Commission set forth at Jefferson County Code, Section 18.15.132. These regulations will be the basis for the application, review, and possible approval of this Plan amendment and master plan approval. Project-specific permits are necessary to build a specific project, but any subsequent permits would have to be consistent with the approvals given in the Plan under consideration. The proposal is also reviewed under the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), and the County has required an EIS to assure that environmental issues are addressed at a logical time and in an appropriate context. As such, the environmental review is a staged or “phased review” which is permitted under SEPA. The master plan programmatic review presently before the County for review and approval considers the overall propriety and implications of the resort in the proposed setting and addresses how impacts may be avoided and necessary mitigation may be assured. Project-level review, which comes later in the process, occurs in connection with the application for a specific permit, so the specific engineering requirements to assure both compliance with the master plan and protection of the environment are achieved. As such, the programmatic view of the project is conceptual; the project review of the proposal will be site and time specific.

The master plan program in Jefferson County also requires a development agreement, authorized by RCW 36.70B.170, to identify development standards, phasing, responsibility for implementation, and period of vesting to County standards for the planned development to assure that the conceptual master plan will be carried out as proposed.

The EIS under review is a programmatic EIS issued to address non-project actions.<sup>1</sup> The Environmental Impact Statement is part of the project review and public process, which for this project will include a review by a Planning Commission, committee with public involvement particularly from the Brinnon Subarea, public hearing(s) before the Planning Commission, and ultimately a public hearing before the Board of County Commissioners before any final action is taken.

Due to the size of the project, and the areas involved, the County has determined that the public comment period for the EIS will last through the public hearings on the project by the Planning Commission. The Final EIS will incorporate all comments received and recommendations by the Planning Commission. The Final EIS is required to be issued at least seven days prior to action by the Board of County Commissioners, anticipated in December 2007.

During the environmental review process, written materials may be directed to the Department of Community Development at any time, and they will be made part of the record. In addition, public review before the Planning Commission committee and the Planning Commission will also address environmental issues. Once the Planning Commission makes its final recommendations, the County will complete its environmental review and issue the Final EIS before the Board of County Commissioners takes any action on the approval.

The EIS is processed by the County through the Environmental Review Official, Stacie Hoskins, and information about the EIS may be obtained at the Department of Community Development between the weekday hours of 9 am and 4:30 pm, located at 621 Sheridan Street, Port Townsend, WA 98368; telephone: 360/379-4450. Many materials are also posted on line at:  
[http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Black Point MPR.htm](http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us/commdevelopment/Black_Point_MPR.htm)

Published by Jefferson County

This 5<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2007

Stacie Hoskins, Planning Manager  
SEPA Responsible Official

---

<sup>1</sup> A non-project action is an agency decision on policies, plans, and programs (WAC 197-11-704) pursuant to the State Environmental Policy Act, Chapter 43.21C RCW, and the implementing regulations at Chapter 197-11 WAC.

# FACT SHEET

<p><b><i>Project Title</i></b></p>	<p>Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)</p>
<p><b><i>Description of Proposal</i></b></p>	<p>The proposed action is a non project action to amend the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan to add approval for a Master Planned Resort in the Black Point area of the Brinnon Subarea Plan, Application MLA06-87. The proposed Master Planned Resort will be developed on 256± acres and will include a golf course, central resort facility, additional commercial uses, and residential additions to the Pleasant Harbor Marina area with a total of 890 residential units.</p>
<p><b><i>Location of Proposal</i></b></p>	<p>Pleasant Harbor, south of Brinnon at US HWY 101 &amp; Black Point Rd. in Jefferson County, Washington. Parcel Numbers 502153002, 003, 023, 022, 021 &amp; 020; APN 502154002; APN 502152005, 012, 013, 014, 015 &amp; 016, in Sections 15 &amp; 22, Township 25, Range 02 West, WM, located in Brinnon, WA 98320.</p>
<p><b><i>Historic Reference</i></b></p>	<p>Proposal area has been subject to logging and was formerly a 500-unit NACO/Thousand Trails seasonal campground for trailers and campers. Presently a 285-boat slip marina with associated retail commercial outlet and approval for 60-unit RV park are in place.</p>
<p><b><i>Proposed Action</i></b></p>	<p>Adoption of a Comprehensive Plan amendment approving the Master Planned Resort and associated approval of a development agreement confirming mitigation phasing and development regulation vesting rules required by the County.</p>
<p><b><i>Proponent</i></b></p>	<p>Statesman Group of Companies          U.S. Head Office          9300 E. Raintree Drive, Suite 100          Scottsdale, AZ, 85260 USA</p> <p>Corporate Head Office:          7370 Sierra Morena Blvd SW          Calgary, Alberta, CANADA T3H 4H9</p>
<p><b><i>Date of Implementation</i></b></p>	<p>Master Plan approval requested December 2007 as part of the County's overall Comprehensive Plan review process.</p>
<p><b><i>Lead Agency</i></b></p>	<p>Jefferson County          Department of Community Development</p>

<b>Responsible Official</b>	Stacie L. Hoskins Planning Manager Dept. of Community Development 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend, WA 98368
<b>Contact Person</b>	Karen Barrows Assistant Planner Dept. of Community Development 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend, WA 98368
<b>Jefferson County File</b>	MLA06-87
<b>Date of Draft EIS Issuance</b>	September 5, 2007
<b>Date Draft EIS Comments Are Due</b>	Any time through October 24, 2007  Any change of dates or additional opportunities to comment will be reflected on the County website.
<b>Draft EIS Public Hearing</b>	October 3, 2007 before the Planning Commission
<b>Proposed Date of Final Action</b>	December 10, 2007
<b>Location of Draft EIS for Review</b>	Copies of the Draft EIS will be available at:  Jefferson County Department of Community Development 621 Sheridan Street Port Townsend, WA 98368  Fire District #4 Headquarters 272 Schoolhouse Road Brinnon, WA 98320
<b>Cost of Draft EIS</b>	Initial 100 copies available at no charge; disks available from Dept. of Community Development at \$1.10 each; each additional printed copy at cost (estimate \$90 each).
<b>Additional Information</b>	For more information, visit the County website at <a href="http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us">http://www.co.jefferson.wa.us</a> and follow link to 2007 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Cycle

# REQUIRED APPROVALS

<p><b><i>Jefferson County – non project approval</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Comprehensive Plan Amendment to enable the Pleasant Harbor MPR site</li> <li>❖ Land Use Map amendment to identify the Pleasant Harbor Master Planned Resort site</li> <li>❖ Development agreement approval</li> <li>❖ Master Plan approval</li> <li>❖ Unified Development Code amendment to add a section on the Pleasant Harbor MPR</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</i></b></p> <p><b>Golf Course Resort</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golf Course</li> <li>• Hotel and related facilities</li> <li>• Resort Housing</li> <li>• Employee Housing</li> <li>• Wastewater Facility</li> <li>• Water Supply Facility</li> </ul>	<p><b>Local or County Permits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Preliminary/final plat for roads utilities and other infrastructure</li> <li>❖ Stormwater permit for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ preliminary site grading, cut and fill</li> <li>❖ new roads and impervious surfaces</li> <li>❖ construction and operation of the resort properties</li> <li>❖ critical area protection and modification.</li> </ul> </li> <li>❖ Class IV conversion Forest practice permit for predevelopment logging</li> <li>❖ Shoreline permit for any development within 200 feet of the shoreline (close beach access to south and possible wetland mitigation and buffer work)</li> <li>❖ Shoreline exemption for dock replacement for Tunicate eradication</li> <li>❖ Building permits for construction</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</i></b></p> <p><b>Maritime Village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential</li> <li>• Commercial</li> </ul>	<p><b>Local or County Permits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Preliminary and final plat or binding site plan for new roads, utilities infrastructure and any lot modification</li> <li>❖ Stormwater permit for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ preliminary site grading, cut and fill</li> <li>❖ new roads and impervious surfaces</li> <li>❖ construction and operation of the resort properties</li> </ul> </li> <li>❖ Critical area protection and modification</li> </ul>

	<p><b>Local or County Permits (cont.):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Class IV conversion Forest practice permit for predevelopment logging</li> <li>❖ Shoreline Permit for all development within 200 feet of the shoreline of Pleasant Harbor. (Simple dock replacement as part of the Tunicate eradication program with WDFW is considered repair or replacement and would not require a shoreline permit.)</li> <li>❖ Building permits for construction</li> <li>❖ Fuel containment and fire plan (Fire Dist. #4)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</b></p> <p><b>Golf Course Resort</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Golf Course</li> <li>• Hotel and related facilities</li> <li>• Resort Housing</li> <li>• Employee Housing</li> <li>• Wastewater Facility</li> <li>• Water Supply Facility</li> </ul> <p><b>Maritime Village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential</li> <li>• Commercial</li> </ul>	<p><b>State Permits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Wastewater treatment and upland disposal (Class A recycled water) facility permits from WDOE</li> <li>❖ Class A Water System approval by WDOH</li> <li>❖ US HWY 101 right of way access permits for access to US HWY 101 from WDOT</li> <li>❖ Well closure approval by WDOE</li> <li>❖ Hydraulic project approval by WDFW for all work below OHWM in Pleasant Harbor</li> <li>❖ Water rights certificate approval by WDOE</li> <li>❖ Underground storage tank certification by WDOE</li> <li>❖ Construction period air quality permits from air quality authority</li> <li>❖ NPDES general permits for clearing over 5,000 square feet from WDOE</li> </ul>
<p><b>Jefferson County— project approval (phased review applications filed after Master Plan approval):</b></p> <p><b>Maritime Village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residential</li> <li>• Commercial</li> </ul>	<p><b>Federal Permits:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Section 404 and 10 permits for all work in waters of the U.S. and stream modification or crossing (road crossing streams a &amp; b).</li> </ul>

## EIS AUTHORS AND PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTORS

<b>Statesman CEO</b>	Statesman Group of Companies Ltd 7370 Sierra Morena Blvd. SW Calgary, Alberta, CANADA T3H 4H9 Contact: M. Garth Mann Phone: 403-256-4151; Fax: 403-256-6100
<b>Wetlands and Streams, Wildlife, Shorelines and Marina Assessment</b>	GeoEngineers, Inc. 1550 Woodridge Drive SE Shorelines and Marina Assessment Port Orchard, WA 98020 Contact: Wayne Wright Phone: 360-769-8400; Fax: 360-956-1208
<b>Geology and Soils, Aquifer and Hydrology Studies</b>	Subsurface Group LLC 630 6th Street South Kirkland, WA 98033 Contact: Scott Bender Phone: 425-828-7545; Fax: 425-828-7548  Perrone Consulting, Inc. P.S. 11220 Fieldstone Lane NE Bainbridge Island. WA 98110 Contact: Vincent J. Perrone Phone: 206-778-8074
<b>Civil Engineering and Water Reclamation/ Systems</b>	2020 ENGINEERING, Inc. 700 Dupont Street Bellingham, WA 98225 Contact: Mark S. Buehrer Phone: 360-671-2020; Fax: 360-671-0322
<b>Water Engineering Systems</b>	NovaTec Consultants Inc. NovaTec Envirocorp Inc. Suite 101 - 2415 Columbia Street Vancouver, British Columbia Canada V5Y 1N5 Contact: Troy D. Vassos Phone: 604-873-9262; Fax: 604-873-2353
<b>Historical and Cultural Resources Assessment</b>	Western Shore Heritage Services, Inc. 8001 Day Road West, Ste. B Bainbridge Island, WA 98110 Contact: Glen Hartmann Phone: 206-855-9020; Fax: 206-855-9081

<b>Traffic Impact Assessment</b>	Transportation Engineering Northwest PO Box 65254 Seattle, WA 98155 Contact: Michael Read Phone: 206-361-7333 ext. 101; Fax: 206-361-7333
----------------------------------	---

## DISTRIBUTION LIST

<b><i>Copies mailed or delivered to:</i></b>	
<b><i>Jefferson County</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Commission members</li> <li>• Board of County Commissioners</li> <li>• Prosecuting Attorney's Office</li> <li>• Department of Public Works</li> <li>• Department of Health &amp; Human Services, Natural Resources Division</li> <li>• Jefferson County Library at Port Hadlock</li> </ul>
<b><i>State Agencies</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development, Growth Management Services</li> <li>• Department of Ecology, SEPA Unit</li> </ul>
<b><i>Notification of availability emailed or mailed to:</i></b>	
<b><i>Jefferson County</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All other County departments not listed above</li> </ul>
<b><i>Local Agencies &amp; Organizations</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City of Port Townsend</li> <li>• Jefferson County Public Utility District #1</li> <li>• Port of Port Townsend</li> <li>• Jefferson County Conservation District</li> <li>• Washington Environmental Council</li> <li>• Olympic Environmental Council</li> <li>• Wild Olympic Salmon</li> <li>• North Olympic Salmon Coalition</li> <li>• People for a Livable Community</li> <li>• Point-No-Point Treaty Council</li> <li>• Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribe</li> <li>• Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe</li> <li>• Skokomish Tribe</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hoh Tribe</li> <li>• Port Townsend &amp; Jefferson County Leader</li> <li>• Peninsula Daily News</li> <li>• Forks Forum</li> </ul>
<b><i>State Agencies</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Natural Resources (Anne Sharrar &amp; SEPA Review)</li> <li>• Department of Transportation (Bill Wiebe &amp; SEPA Review)</li> <li>• Department of Health (John Aden)</li> <li>• Department of Social &amp; Health Services (Elizabeth McNaghy)</li> <li>• Department of Corrections (Rebecca Barney)</li> <li>• Department of Fish &amp; Wildlife (Steve Penland, Tim Rymer, Jeff Davis &amp; SEPA Review)</li> <li>• Department of Ecology (GMA Review)</li> <li>• Puget Sound Partnership (John Cambalik)</li> <li>• Parks &amp; Recreation Commission (Bill Koss)</li> <li>• Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (Lorinda Anderson)</li> </ul>
<b><i>Other Interested Parties</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Washington Association of Realtors</li> <li>• Bangor US Naval Submarine Base</li> </ul>



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	i
FACT SHEET	iii
SUMMARY	xiii
CHAPTER 1—THE PROPOSAL	1-1
1.1 Location of the Proposal	1-1
1.2 The Proposed Master Plan	1-4
1.3 Summary of the Proposal and Permitting Limitations	1-17
CHAPTER 2—THE PHYSICAL SETTING	2-1
2.1 Location of the Proposal and Alternatives	2-1
2.2 Brinnon Subarea	2-1
2.3 Existing Site Conditions (Black Point/Pleasant Harbor)	2-4
2.4 Hood Canal	2-6
2.5 The Olympic Mountains	2-8
CHAPTER 3—PROBABLE SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACT REVIEW OF THE PROPOSAL	3-1
3.1 Existing Conditions	3-1
3.2 Shellfish	3-2
3.3 Water Resources: Use, Reuse, Management, Treatment, and Disposal	3-11
3.4 Transportation	3-34
3.5 Public Services (including tax burden, rescue services, and health services)	3-49
3.6 Shorelines	3-63
3.7 Fish and Wildlife	3-65
3.8 Rural Character and Population (including housing density, mix retail and rental affordability)	3-66
3.9 Archeological and Cultural Resources	3-67

3.10 Critical Areas	3-67
3.11 Other Issues	3-72

CHAPTER 4—DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES REVIEWED AND IMPACTS 4-1

4.1 No Action Alternative	4-1
4.2 Brinnon Subarea Plan Alternative	4-12
4.3 Hybrid Plan	4-20

APPENDICES (in separate volume)

Appendix 1	Historic Reference site plan and topography maps of American Campground
Appendix 2	<i>Marina Impact Analysis</i> , 8/15/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 3	<i>Shoreline Characterization Report</i> , 8/3/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 4	<i>Soils and Geology Evaluation</i> , 8/10/07 prepared by Subsurface Group
Appendix 5	<i>Water Supply and Groundwater Impact Analysis</i> , 6/26/06, revised 8/14/07, prepared by Subsurface Group
Appendix 6	<i>Transportation Impact Study</i> , 8/28/07, prepared by Transportation Engineering Northwest
Appendix 7	<i>Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment</i> , 7/20/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 8	<i>Cultural Resource Assessment for the Proposed Pleasant Harbor Marina and Golf Resort, Jefferson County, WA</i> , 6/30/06, prepared by Western Shore Heritage Services
Appendix 9	<i>Wetland Delineation</i> , 7/20/06, prepared by GeoEngineers
Appendix 10	Example of a Notice of Mariners with map showing restricted or closed areas of Dabab Bay (DBRC)

# SUMMARY

The EIS describes a proposal for an amendment to the Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan and development regulations to add a new Master Planned Resort in the Brinnon Subarea of Jefferson County. The Master Plan proposal sets forth a conceptual plan for a resort hotel and rental units, combined with a significant expansion of the Marina Village facilities at Pleasant Harbor. The proposal under review would establish a Master Plan allowing up to 890 units and corresponding resort commercial development within the Master Plan area, subject to conditions imposed by the County through the approval of the amendment, if granted. The approval at this stage is only "programmatically" and additional environmental review is required at the project level when the specifics of any phase are identified in more detail and reviewed for permit approval.

The County issued a scoping notice asking the applicant to respond to nine different specific issues including: (1) shellfish; (2) water quality, quantity, and use; (3) transportation; (4) public services, including tax burden, rescue services, and health services; (5) shorelines; (6) fish and wildlife; (7) rural character; (8) archeological and cultural resources; and (9) critical areas, including wetlands, aquifer recharge, frequently flooded areas, fish and wildlife conservation areas, and geologically hazardous areas.

The project description is set forth in more detail in Chapter 1, and the setting and amenities in the surrounding area are identified in Chapter 2. The potentially significant adverse environmental impacts are identified in Chapter 3 and the comparative impact of the alternatives is identified in Chapter 4. The alternatives include a no action alternative, a resort encompassing the entire area identified in the Brinnon Subarea Plan as a potential Master Planned Resort, and a hybrid alternative that identifies a combination of Master Plan approval for the proposed project and rural resort type development on adjacent properties.

The potential impacts are identified under the topic headings noted, and each section has detailed mitigation requirements to be imposed at the project level. Specific project caps and limits were set forth in the project review to make sure County concerns at the programmatic level were addressed.

(1) Shellfish—The area is an important shellfish area and the waters around Pleasant Harbor and in Hood Canal are important for all varieties of fish as well as shellfish, so water quality is a major element.

Key mitigation points:

- Class A reuse and recycling program required to avoid process water discharge to Hood Canal.
- Treatment of all waters at the marina area to assure 2005 Puget Sound water quality standards are met for all discharges.
- Tunicate eradication program in concert with WDFW to help eradicate an invasive species.
- Stormwater management plan for all clearing and grading to assure that the goal of no discharge of contaminants to the waters of Hood Canal or Pleasant Harbor is achieved.

The detailed mitigation requirements are found at Section 3.2.7, and detailed discussions of water quality and harbor and marina-related issues are found in Appendix 2 and Appendix 3.

(2) Water Resource Use, Reuse, Management, Treatment, and Disposal—The proposal is required to use an onsite wastewater treatment reuse and recycling program with no discharge to Hood Canal for

storm and treated waters. The proposal also looks to a rainwater harvesting program to supplement existing water rights and looks to both low impact development and low flow fixtures to provide a reduced water service demand for the project.

The key conditions include:

- A requirement to obtain necessary water rights in advance of proceeding to preliminary plat approval or public hearing for the project, including investigation of alternate water resources that may be available.
- A requirement to have approved and installed a wastewater treatment system that is capable of processing all site water demands to Class A recycled capability.
- A requirement to have sufficient onsite water storage to provide year around irrigation and sustainable firefighting capability on site.

The detailed mitigation requirements are found at Section 3.3.8, and a detailed discussion of water-related issues are discussed in the Water Supply and Groundwater Impact Analysis, Appendix 5.

(3) Transportation—The project fronts US HWY 101 and is projecting a significant increase in traffic in the local area once the resort is operational. Levels of Service (LOS) away from the resort are not significantly impacted, but traffic control at the intersection is a major concern and will need to be addressed in detail at the permitting stage (project level).

Key transportation issues and concerns:

- The entry and exit points for the marina and resort need to be sufficiently far from US HWY 101 to permit the intersection to operate safely. For this reason the entry to the golf resort is proposed to be 0.7 miles east on Black Point Road, and the proposed access near US HWY 101 limited to emergency and limited purposes only.
- The resort is providing bicycle and pedestrian pathways to encourage nonmotorized circulation through the resort and to provide a "safe haven" for bicyclists who are on US HWY 101 and seek to get off the highway for the length of the resort.
- The resort is required to do a detailed traffic report at the commencement of each phase submitted for permits to get approval of intersections from the State Highway Department for US HWY 101 and from the County for all other public and private roads to assure (1) all roads are constructed to appropriate standards, (2) emergency access and escape is provided for all units, and (3) all necessary infrastructure to serve traffic and circulation is completed with each phase.

The detailed traffic mitigation requirements are included at Section 3.4.4, and the Transportation Impact Study is at Appendix 6.

(4) Public Services—Additional community concerns include: the ability of the community to provide public facilities and public services to the community, and how to design the community to provide the economic benefits intended by the Comprehensive Plan and still minimize impact on the overall character of the community. The issues are addressed in detail in Section 3.5.

Public capability and services are identified and the additional new services are to be identified through a memorandum of understanding with the public service providers, including County, health, schools,

and emergency services. (See 3.5.1.5, Fire Protection and Emergency Service Mitigation and 3.5.2.2., 3.5.3.1, 3.5.4.)

An additional concern was the combination of economic and rural character implications of locating a major resort in the Brinnon area. The County Comprehensive Plan currently identifies the site as an appropriate location for a Master Planned Resort.

At the Master Plan approval level, the EIS examines the economic and environmental issues and recommended mitigation. (See Section 3.5.5, Economy, Housing and Employment.)

Brinnon is short of rental housing for a large construction crew that is expected to be onsite for about five years as the project develops. The applicant identified using the existing 60-unit RV park on the Black Point property for construction workers during the development to mitigate the impact of a large influx of new workers.

The project is expected to provide new employment and spending in the community, create demand for new facilities and services in the Brinnon Rural Village Center, and impact the local property values to some degree, which is already occurring as a result of the County's indication in the Comprehensive Plan that the Brinnon Subarea is a target for some form of a Master Planned Resort. Land values are also increasing independently of the resort proposal (which has been discussed for many years), simply due to the increasing demand for recreation and retirement property which Hood Canal fits so well due to its proximity to major metropolitan areas.

Mitigation designed to protect the overall rural character and yet assure the development of a successful resort are to hold the overall density to less than four units per acre (roughly the density of the waterfront development surrounding the project and along Hood Canal in the vicinity); provide specific limits on the number of units and impervious surface; provide for the protection of the shoreline bluffs and preservation of significant wetland and natural buffer areas; and build the taller buildings into the hillside with below level parking to have most structures be at a residential height level (35 feet) when viewed from off the property. The overall area's rural character is also preserved by the County rural density and limited uses in the rural zones, which are in place surrounding the resort, together with the limitation that the resort public facilities (sewer and water) cannot be used to serve uses outside of the resort.

More detailed requirements are set forth at Section 3.5.9.

(5) Shorelines—The Pleasant Harbor Resort is located on Suburban (Pleasant Harbor) and Rural (Hood Canal) Shorelines and as such are subject to the requirements of the Shoreline Master Program for Jefferson County. A detailed discussion of the shoreline requirements and Master Plan response is set forth in Section 3.6 and addresses land use (particularly the prohibition for stormwater or other discharge to Hood Canal to protect water quality), the preservation of a shoreline buffer on the south shore to provide a natural riparian zone for water quality and habitat protection, limiting public access to the Pleasant Harbor side where safe access and water quality issues can be addressed, and closing off public access to the south shore where safe access cannot reasonably be provided due to the steep cliffs and where water quality protection could be in jeopardy. Shoreline conditions are detailed at Section 3.6.7.

(6) Fish and Wildlife—Fish and wildlife are addressed in Section 3.7, with specific details discussed in the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Assessment, Appendix 7. The site evaluation identified some habitat benefits for the project site, but no primary association by threatened or endangered species. The site is retaining over 39% natural open space in addition to the golf course and other open areas, and providing both wetland and wetland buffers and the riparian buffer along the south canal shoreline for

habitat value. There is also a buffer strip of mature trees between US HWY 101 and the Maritime Village, which provides existing habitat benefits and is to be retained. The development of more than 100 acres of the site into a golf course, Maritime Village, resort housing, and related facilities will necessarily have an impact on the wildlife that does use the site presently. But these tend to be local birds and small mammals in no danger of extirpation in the area. The native habitat that does remain is to be retained in patches rather than small strips, which does improve habitat quality and usefulness over a wider range of species. Habitat mitigation is found in Section 3.7.4 and Appendix 7, and the requirement at the permit level to provide specific habitat mitigation plans in concert with each development phase to control stormwater and assure that wetlands, buffers, and protected open space habitat are identified and protected through all phases of operation and construction.

(7) Rural Character and Population—This section (Section 3.8) also addresses the issues of housing and the potential changes in the Brinnon Subarea as a result of the resort. Mitigation is identified in Sections 3.5.7 and 3.5.9 discussed above.

(8) Archeological and Cultural Resources—Any large-scale project needs an archeological assessment to make sure that cultural and archeological resources are not disturbed or compromised. An assessment was done finding no sites of significance in the areas to be developed. (See Cultural Resources Assessment, Appendix 8.) Mitigation includes a requirement to notify proper authorities if such resources are identified during any level of project development.

(9) Critical areas—The EIS discusses the key critical areas affected by the project, including the wetlands (Section 3.10.1), aquifer recharge areas (Section 3.10.2), fish and wildlife conservation areas (Section 3.10.3), and geologically hazardous areas (Section 3.10.5). The site has no flood hazard areas. The objective of the proposal was to avoid impacts where possible, so the steep bluffs of the south shore are protected by a significant setback, and the steep slope rules provide for setbacks in the Marina Village area where slopes occur. Wetlands and buffers are also avoided, with the exception of Wetland B in the golf course area, which is in the kettle necessary for the irrigation and water reuse reservoir. Where this wetland is being disturbed, however, mitigation plans require a significant replacement wetland and buffer to be identified and installed prior to any actions to remove the existing wetland. Requirements are also in place to protect the water quality of the wetlands during both construction and operations, and to make sure the golf course is operated consistent with County regulations for golf courses in aquifer sensitive areas. (The County has adopted King County standards for such uses.) Critical area mitigation measures are identified at Section 3.10.6.

Alternatives were evaluated, including the no action alternative, a proposal to designate the entire BSAP MPR area as a resort, and a hybrid looking at the Pleasant Harbor proposal east of US HWY 101 and a rural development directed to recreational use consistent with rural regulations, but recognizing the proximity with the resort would generate demand for more intense rural uses with the resort than without. All of the alternative uses and potential impacts are addressed in Chapter 4.

With the exception of the No Action Alternative, the alternatives all have similar impacts since the bulk of the property is put to resort uses, which mean they share similar impacts in terms of clearing, grading, and development and share common mitigation requirements with the proposal to avoid, minimize, or protect and mitigate the environmental values discussed.

The principal differences are discussed.

The No Action Alternative presumes the existing proposals for west of US HWY 101 would be in place and the marina would continue in its current status, but that the property east of US HWY 101 would be developed into a small local golf course and 24 home sites, plus six on the existing marina lots, for a total of 30 new residences. The major differences are that the No Action Alternative would be solely

Rural (through a Planned Rural Residential Development) and would have to rely on existing water rights and individual wells on the separate properties. Mitigation to avoid water quality impacts would be required, but the site would be less developed and significantly less traffic would be attracted to the site for use. The major differences are lack of public water and sewer facilities, less of the overall site developed and more retained in natural settings, and significantly less traffic. The No Action Alternative also does not provide the economic and community benefits contemplated in the Comprehensive Plan of a Master Planned Resort.

The Brinnon Subarea Plan Alternative assumes a different format for the development, with 24 units in houses on 15 lots along the southern shore and marina properties, and a 200-unit hotel resort conference center on the property south of Black Point. The major difference with the Pleasant Harbor Resort proposal is that the entire 310 acres would be brought into the resort and the resort would develop a resort village with commercial services on the properties west of US HWY 101. The intense development of the MPR property would require similar facilities and conditions as the Master Plan proposal under review.

Water, sewer, and other public facilities can accommodate the proposal and the same mitigation requirements would be in place for the BSAP Alternative as the Master Planned Resort under review. The major difference is in traffic. The US HWY 101 alignment, speed, grade, and site distances are such that crossing movements would be a safety factor and likely unable to retain the "C" level of service required on US HWY 101. A signalized intersection would not be permitted under current standards for highway design, and as such grade separation for both traffic and pedestrians would be required.

The Hybrid Alternative assumes the Master Plan for the east side of US HWY 101, so the programs and mitigation identified in Chapter 3 would be required. On the west side the additional development is permitted under County rural rules, but would be limited by the need to serve the project with septic tanks and individual wells. Here again, water quality and quantity conditions are required to protect water quality. The issue of traffic separation and ingress and egress onto US HWY 101 is an issue to be addressed at the permit level and will pose challenges due to the volumes of traffic and the need to avoid any unsafe turning movements. Coordinated traffic planning will be important and will be the principal issue. The other impacts and mitigations are similar to the Master Plan and the BSAP Alternative and similar conditions would be expected.

Additional information on permit-related conditions may be found in the Appendices.

