

GLEN COVE/TRI AREA SPECIAL STUDY

FINAL DECISION DOCUMENT

June 11, 2001

Note: This document (including the two accompanying maps showing Provisional Urban Growth Area boundaries at the Tri Area and Glen Cove) was unanimously endorsed by Board of County Commissioner motion at their June 11, 2001 public meeting. This document is meant to provide background information and discussion related to the Board's decision to move forward with sub-area and capital facilities planning in these two areas.

Section 1: Introduction

In August 1998 Jefferson County adopted its Comprehensive Plan. It was based on the Washington Growth Management Act and resulted from an eight-year community planning process. After undergoing a series of appeals and adjustments, the 1998 Plan was found by the Western Washington Growth Hearings Board to be a well-conceived, well-written and GMA-compliant document.

After the August 1998 adoption, there was work left to do. As with every plan, there must be implementation. "Subarea" or community plans must be developed, capital projects must be built and land use regulations must be modified. These efforts will all be based on the Comprehensive Plan, which itself must be reviewed and updated in 2003.

During these intervening years another important planning effort was underway. It involved two issues remaining after adoption of the Plan. Each of these issues was analyzed in a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) which was circulated for public comment in draft form in June 1999. The first issue involved the question of how much commercial and industrial land was needed in North County through 2016. This was determined through the "Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study" also called the Trottier Report. Analysis of South County needs (Brinnon, Quilcene, et al) will occur later as part of community planning efforts in those areas.

After a great amount of community discussion, the Special Study provided an estimate (212 to 280) for how many additional acres, beyond those acres already designated in the 1998 Plan, should be designated as commercial and/or industrial. The Special Study number is an estimate that will impact the size of the UGA. The size of a UGA will be a function, in part, of which residential land use densities are chosen for land within any UGA boundary. The number estimated in the Special Study will change as so-called 'reduction factors' [truly a misnomer] add acres to that total in order to account for, among other things, critical areas, mandatory set-backs and rights-of-way, all of which are locations where commercial enterprises cannot be placed or installed but which are simultaneously also inescapable realities that will impact the amount of acreage needed for future commercial development proposals. In other words, solely by way of example, the County may need to designate 10 acres commercial or industrial in order to obtain

seven (7) buildable commercial or industrial acres. Furthermore, the GMA allows for a market factor, i.e., an intentional surplus of acreage in excess of expected demand, to be included when determining the size of lands to be designated commercial or industrial. A subsection of the estimate provided by the Special Study indicates that some 43 to 58 additional industrial acres will be needed in this County during the 20-year planning process contemplated by this Plan. All of these estimates assume that employment in this County will grow at a rate of 4% each year. A lower growth rate of 3.1% would reduce the need for additional commercial or industrial acreage to about 87. If a growth rate below 3.1% is assumed, then, essentially, there would be no need for any additions to the industrial or commercial zoning already in place. The County will use the estimates found in the Special Study to help determine the UGA boundaries and to determine, only if permitted by law and judicial decision, if any LAMIRD boundaries require expansion.

The other issue left unresolved by 1998 Plan adoption involved the Tri-Area community and whether all or part of the Tri-Area will be or will not be included within the boundaries of any future Urban Growth Area or “UGA.” A move has been underway for the past several years to incorporate this area into a new city. Because of state law only an area designated as a UGA is permitted to have a referendum on whether that area should be formally incorporated as a city.

Designation of a UGA under the Growth Management Act requires that certain criteria be met, chiefly that the area to be so designated must be characterized by urban growth or must be adjacent to an area characterized by urban growth, that it is be serviceable by an “urban” level of service. Any UGA within unincorporated Jefferson County must be sized in reasonable proportion to the population growth forecasted by the State for this County.

Some have argued that these criteria are not met in the Tri-Area, while others say that they are. The SEIS analyzed the arguments set forth by both sides. The BOCC must decide if a UGA of any size is supportable under the Growth Management Act and if it does, then it may designate a UGA in the area. If a UGA is not factually supportable, then the County must work with the Tri-Area community to resolve those issues that prompted the incorporation effort in the first place. Further, if only a portion of the Tri-Area is found to support a UGA designation, then efforts must be undertaken to ensure that the broad sense of community felt in both UGA and non-UGA areas is maintained.

A question has been raised regarding how these proposals relate to the normal Plan amendment process. The answer that will be generated by the completion of the Special Study and Glen Cove/Tri-Area issue represents an extension- of the 1998 Comprehensive Plan adoption process. The County anticipated resolving these items during a one-year post adoption process. Now, after a significant expenditure of time and capital, the County is poised to complete the task three years later.

There has been significant public discussion over the issues analyzed in the Supplemental EIS. This discussion centered on four decision possibilities analyzed in that document:

~~☒~~ To make no changes to the Plan – No Action Alternative;

- ~~///~~ To accommodate new commercial and industrial land needs within the one existing UGA in Port Townsend by “intensifying” land uses through zoning changes or performance standards – Action Alternative 1;
- ~~///~~ To designate the “logical boundary” and its surrounding area in Glen Cove as an extension of the Port Townsend UGA – Action Alternative 2;
- ~~///~~ To designate a separate Urban Growth Area in the Tri-Area – Action Alternative 3.

The Supplemental EIS was completed in August 1999. A Draft "Decision Document" was circulated in September 1999, with hearings held by the Planning Commission during that same month. Having reviewed substantial citizen comment, it is time to determine what Plan additions will, in fact, be made to resolve the central issues. The discussion to date has been about “alternatives” and the BOCC must now turn its attention toward a decision. The two key objectives of the BOCC are to ensure balance and fairness in its decision. The Board is impressed by the thoughtfulness behind all of the arguments and believes that equitable solutions can be found. It is mindful however of past challenges to the Plan and current laws affecting it. The Board must ensure that whatever solutions are adopted can meet both local desires and State requirements.

The following sections outline the principles used by BOCC in making its decision on amendments to the Plan. They present discussion of the key issues raised by the public and the County’s response to them. They then describe the general objectives of the overall proposal package. Also included are “line-in, line-out” language representing the changes to the Comprehensive Plan that are to be adopted by the elected County Commissioners.

Section 2: Amendment Principles

The Board must craft its decisions with respect to the two study issues in a manner that is consistent with the County's adopted Comprehensive Plan and the GMA. The Board also desires to address these issues in a manner that will be acceptable to a majority of Jefferson County citizens. The BOCC is mindful of past decisions of the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board and strives to develop solutions that meet the various tests of GMA compliance as outlined in those decisions. The BOCC believes that the following principles, if built into the final Plan amendments, will achieve these purposes.

- ~~///~~ The rural character and small town atmosphere of Jefferson County is viewed by most as a major asset. This must be maintained. The Board views this process as addressing issues in our more urbanizing areas of the County. No action should be taken that threatens the quality of rural areas.
- ~~///~~ New urban growth should be channeled into areas that are already characterized by urban growth. The County must be supportive of efforts to provide services scaled to the needs of these urban or suburban areas.
- ~~///~~ Capital facilities must be scaled to need and to the ability of businesses, homeowners, workers and the public to finance them. Further, the effects of infrastructure

development on land values and the resulting effects on the property taxes of our existing residents must be fully understood before actual construction programs are put in place. Infrastructure development is only an improvement if it addresses a quality of life need and imposes no unnecessary cost burdens on residents and businesses.

☞ Affordable housing in Jefferson County is a significant issue and an overriding goal. In 1990, the median family household income for Jefferson County was \$29,907. The Hadlock median family income was \$20,753. In 1994, 30 percent of Tri-Area residents had self-reported incomes of less than \$15,000. Furthermore 41 percent of Irondale residents, 42 percent of Chimacum residents, and 37 percent of Port Hadlock residents reported incomes of less than \$25,000.

Plan changes that will assist in expanding opportunities for housing will be supported. If the changes place additional strains on the affordable housing supply, then they will not be supported.

☞ Future infrastructure improvements must be appropriate for the planned development densities in the County.

☞ UGAs will be used where urban services are necessary to support higher density residential and/or commercial growth. The level of urban infrastructure must serve the needs of the public, protect the environment and be affordable.

☞ Logical boundary expansions, to the extent permitted by law, will be used where rural levels of service are sufficient to support existing patterns of clustered development that do not meet the criteria for UGA designation.

☞ The Tri-Area must be allowed to develop as a community with or without a UGA. Areas outside a UGA can still be a part of the “community”.

☞ Business owners must be protected and be allowed to thrive, whether they are located inside or outside a UGA or a tightline “logical boundary”.

☞ Whatever solutions are found for the unincorporated study area, there should be no harm done to the aspirations of the City of Port Townsend or the South County region in terms of how each wishes to grow. Conversely, issues of mutual importance to City and County citizens must be addressed as land use, infrastructure, annexation, incorporation or other implementing measures occur.

Urban Growth Areas vs. Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development

This discussion arises out of Action Alternative 1 as identified in the August 1999 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS). There has been much debate over the question of whether a new UGA should be created, or if existing UGA or existing LAMIRDs (an acronym for “limited areas of more intensive rural development”)

such as Quilcene or Brinnon need to be expanded. In fact, the latter issue, the possible expansion of LAMIRD logical boundaries, has been the subject of a petition before the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board later appealed to the Superior Court when the Hearings Board ruled that LAMIRD boundaries are not subject to redrawing. The SEIS has provided facts and figures relative to the impacts of each. There are advantages and disadvantages in using either to solve the issues of concern to the public.

An urban growth area defines a future course for a community's development in areas where an intensive mix of housing, employment and retail services is desired (or for stand-alone commercial/industrial development areas in the case of Glen Cove.) LAMIRD boundaries generally recognize historical patterns of intensive growth in which commercial and residential development occurred in more isolated settlements, and they are often located some substantial distance from any region that might someday satisfy the criteria for UGA designation. Either designation carries with it certain responsibilities and costs.

Creating a UGA carries with it a commitment by local government and residents that a large share of future growth will be accepted in the area. UGAs were authorized under GMA to ensure protection of rural areas by concentrating most population and economic growth inside urban boundaries. Whatever perception people have that they live in a rural area, this will change at locations where UGAs are designated.

On the plus side, UGA designation presents opportunities for solving the commercial/industrial land supply needs outlined in the Trottier Report. Residents of the Tri-Area view the Hadlock commercial center as an important community asset, providing retail services closer to home and reducing the number of shopping or service trips to Port Townsend. Many would like to see this center expand along with the population. The Tri-Area is seen as an historical population center that offers affordable housing opportunities for the public. The BOCC supports expanded housing opportunities in this area.

The City of Port Townsend has expressed interest in potentially expanding its UGA to include all or part of the Glen Cove industrial area, including the Port Townsend Paper Mill. The City views this as a logical expansion of its City limits at some point in the future. UGA designation would involve several issues – provision of services, water supplies, revenue impacts, service impacts, etc. -- needing to be resolved between the Mill, the City, other service providers, and the County prior to any future urban levels of development or UGA annexation.

With UGA designation and increasing development densities comes the need for more sophisticated infrastructure – sewers, water systems, stormwater management, roads, parks, etc. The pace of infrastructure development will affect how quickly residential, commercial and industrial development can occur. Setting aside areas for more intensive development carries with it a commitment that systems will be put in place to protect the environment and enhance the quality of living. Not coordinating infrastructure growth

and installation with new development raises the specter of growth either not meeting its target in these urban areas or the quality of life being degraded. Equally crucial is pacing the installation of new infrastructure so the pace of installation does not exceed the financial means of the public paying for it. To do otherwise reduces the likelihood that the infrastructure will be put in place. It will also threaten the housing affordability goals of the County.

The BOCC has studied extensively the issue of what defines an urban level of service in the proposed UGA areas. It is satisfied that the functioning of these systems to meet the above goals is paramount. Adoption of a level of service standard (or "LOS") more typically found in large cities is not necessary, appropriate or affordable. Thus, a good sewage treatment system is more important than insisting upon installation of a sanitary sewer system, per se; a good and safe road system is more important than having curbs, gutters and sidewalks along every mile of road; a safe and abundant supply of water should be the goal for every resident of the County. If these objectives can be met, then growth will ultimately provide a tax base for long-term improvement of these facilities to a full urban standard. Insisting on a strict urban LOS standard at this point may stifle or hinder the very growth the County is attempting to encourage.

"Logical outer boundaries" delineate what the GMA calls LAMIRDs. While the LAMIRDs provide an alternative to UGAs, they have their own problems. They were authorized by the GMA in recognition of patterns of rural intensive development existing before GMA was enacted. They recognize that there will be areas of more intense development outside of Urban Growth Boundaries which themselves do not and cannot meet the criteria for UGA designation. LAMIRDs can include vacant land and serve to allow existing residential and business uses to thrive and, in a very limited way, expand.

LAMIRDs provide a measure of fairness in GMA by recognizing past trends and future boundaries. However, a strict interpretation of how they should be used has created problems for the businesses in Glen Cove and the Tri-Area community. Some businesses in Glen Cove have been excluded from the logical boundary simply because they were established after 1990 but before the adoption of the County's GMA Comprehensive Plan. These businesses met the rules of the County at the time, but GMA allowed only those businesses developing before 1990 to be included inside the logical boundary of the Glen Cove LAMIRD. Business owners are rightfully confused as to why, having met the County's requirements, they now possess "non-conforming" status for GMA purposes.

In the Tri-Area, there is a strong sense of community from Chimacum to Irondale to Hadlock. These areas have a common history, many common problems and many common goals. Because of the urban and rural mix in the community, some portions of the Tri-Area were included in LAMIRDs with the balance designated as rural residential. This has created confusion for those trying to maintain the community identity because this approach tends to divide the area rather than tying it together.

Designation of areas within Glen Cove or the Tri-Area as either UGAs or LAMIRDs should serve to solve problems and serve community goals and should not create consequences for the public. The Board has struggled with this balance of serving the interests of existing residents and businesses while meeting the requirements of the GMA where, in the cases cited, there are potential conflicts. The elected Commissioners recognize the desire by some people to create community solidarity in the Tri-Area and by others to protect the economic vitality of Glen Cove.

To the extent UGA creation truly assists both groups, we support the UGA approach. To the extent that UGA creation would cause more stress on these areas in terms of environmental quality, housing affordability or urbanization of rural areas, we choose to find other means of addressing those desires. Among these is limited expansion of existing LAMIRDs to the extent permitted by law.

The BOCC is confident that limited UGAs are possible at Glen Cove and in Irondale/Port Hadlock. The elected Commissioners believe such UGAs can meet community objectives and pass GMA muster; and that negative effects can be avoided with mutual agreements among citizens, service providers, the City of Port Townsend and the County. Accordingly, the BOCC will designate Urban Growth Area Boundaries (UGA) as a next step in meeting the objectives of the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study.

If satisfactory agreement can be reached regarding the levels of public service, the cost and phasing of improvements, reasonable sources of revenue, land use distribution and community acceptance, the BOCC will make those UGAs permanent. This will be accomplished through the formation of two Community Planning Groups (CPG) to prepare Sub-Area Plans for UGA implementation in step with Tasks V and VI of the Special Study. The Special Study, in conjunction with the Trottier Report, addresses the future needs of UGA planning. However, the common thread between UGA and LAMIRD planning is the allocation of commercial and industrial land. It is important to understand that the completion of this Comprehensive Plan process to designate UGA boundaries is not the end of the community planning process and more importantly that urban levels of development cannot occur until urban infrastructure needs are planned and urban land use development regulations are promulgated and adopted by the BoCC.

UGA/Logical Boundary Alternatives

Maps included with this Decision Document depict the Urban Growth Area Boundaries in both Glen Cove and Irondale/Port Hadlock.

This alternative addresses the legitimate concerns held by the elected Commissioners with respect to the business vitality of the Glen Cove area. It is reasonable, in light of a documented deficiency in available commercial and industrial land to include many more of those businesses in a UGA and to allow the infilling of properties around them.

With regard to the Tri-Area, the elected County Commissioners looked long and hard at whether the facts supported a UGA that included Irondale, Port Hadlock and Chimacum.

In the end, it was clear to County staff that such a large UGA would not pass GMA muster. The potential cost to the taxpayer both inside and outside this area would have been much too high to risk a UGA or city of that size. The Board supports creation of an Urban Growth Area boundary in the area displaying higher density housing and a commercial center, i.e., Port Hadlock and Irondale.

Total acreages under each UGA would be (see attached maps):

Glen Cove UGA	Irondale/ Port Hadlock (Tri Area) UGA
245 acres	1232 acres

Urban Reserve Areas

Regardless of its decision on UGA designations, the Board is sensitive to the desires of the Tri-Area to develop as a community and of the City of Port Townsend to potentially expand its UGA boundaries into outlying and now unincorporated commercial and industrial areas. The GMA provides for the designation of urban reserve areas outside of UGAs to set aside a supply of land for employment and mixed land uses for possible future inclusion in a UGA. Policies must provide direction for the designation of urban reserve areas and conditions for their future inclusion in the UGA.

The Board will use the urban reserve area approach in those areas where there is a likelihood that future UGA expansions could occur, although such designation is not warranted at this time. This is the best means of declaring where future growth will occur, allowing citizens to plan for that eventuality.

Final Urban Reserve designations will be decided as a result of work by the Community Planning Group and will be a part of the Sub-Area Plan for the Port Hadlock/Irondale UGA implementation.

Section 3: Goals and Findings

Summary Description:

The Urban Growth Area boundaries will:

- ~~the~~ designate a UGA boundary in the Glen Cove industrial area;
- ~~the~~ emphasize protecting rural areas to the west of Glen Cove from incompatible uses and visual impacts through the adoption of a Corridor Management Plan addressing access, setbacks, uniform signage, and buffering;
- ~~the~~ designate a limited UGA in the Irondale/Hadlock area;

- ~~§~~ highlight the Hadlock area as a center for commerce and higher density, affordable housing;
- ~~§~~ absorb the Ness' Corner General Crossroad and Irondale Corner General Crossroad commercial districts into the Port Hadlock/Irondale UGA; and
- ~~§~~ consider an Urban Reserve Area in the Tri-Area to reflect the future direction of growth when and if UGA expansions become warranted.

Rural character and small town atmosphere

The existing Comprehensive Plan has done a good job of defining areas of rural development. There is little disagreement that areas outside the UGA, the Tri-Area and outside designated LAMIRD boundaries are either, for the most part, rural or resource lands and should remain so. The focus of the current study has been on whether to achieve the needed commercial and industrial land needs in existing or expanded LAMIRDS or within existing or new urban growth areas. This focus is appropriate and the Board intends that it remain in any revised Plan. In adopting specific amendments, the Board will strive to balance any increase in density or commercial intensity outside these areas.

In adopting this finding, the Board recognizes that the Jefferson County International Airport, which is identified as an Essential Public Facility, remains a viable site for certain aviation-related commerce and industry.

The BOCC further acknowledges the use of the Major Industrial Development (MID) policy which allows for consideration of large, single industrial users who may wish to locate in Jefferson County, but which may not be able to find sufficient land inside existing Urban Growth Areas. The BOCC is moving forward with altering the Comprehensive Plan language to allow creation and siting of MIDs.

The Board finds that certain areas in the Tri-Area are intensively developed but can retain a small town character with proper controls. The balance between local desires and GMA requirements can be achieved provided the size of the future UGA at Port Hadlock/Irondale area is properly scaled for this County's forecasted population growth.

The Board finds that the total Tri-Area study boundary exceeds both the necessary land area needed for the twenty-year urban growth forecast and the area characterized by urban growth. The Board finds that the cost of likely levels of services necessary for the total Tri-Area would be excessive in light of the ultimate population they would serve.

The Board does find that Irondale and Hadlock contain urban growth characteristics, including adequate levels of existing sewer and water services.

The Board finds that the Special Study is complete for purposes of designating UGA boundary designation and determining if LAMIRD expansions are appropriate.

The Board does find that the public record established for the UGA boundary designations are based upon the several planning studies and represent a thorough and comprehensive analysis of the issues. This Decision Document represents a legislative decision made through local discretion provided to counties by the specific language of the GMA.

New growth channeled into urban growth areas.

The Jefferson County Comprehensive Plan states that UGA boundary changes shall be supported by and dependent on population forecasts and allocated urban population distributions, existing urban densities and infill opportunities, phasing and availability of adequate services, proximity to designated natural resource lands and the presence of critical areas.

There is adequate land set aside in the existing Comprehensive Plan to allow rural commercial and industrial development. There is also sufficient land to accommodate rural residential growth (five acres per dwelling and above) far into the future. The Countywide Planning Policies have established a goal of channeling 60% of new population growth into urban growth areas. The Board reaffirms this objective.

Given the findings of the Port Townsend comprehensive plan regarding the City's ability to accommodate 40% of new growth; and the findings of the current Supplemental EIS that the Tri-Area is able to accommodate and serve the remaining 20%, the Board finds that new population growth can be best accommodated by designating a limited UGA in the Port Hadlock/Irondale Area.

The elected County Commissioners recognize the existence of urban characteristics in the Hadlock/Irondale community and the opportunity for additional higher density housing development to provide dispersed, affordable housing. The Board further finds that the Tri-Area is best suited to accommodate a significant portion of the retail land need identified in the Glen Cove/Tri-Area Special Study. These are best accommodated within a Hadlock/Irondale UGA.

The County will provide zoning that will promote economic development and housing opportunities within the Port Hadlock/Irondale UGA and the logical boundaries. The extent of development will be dependent on the provision of adequate levels of service in these areas.

The Board finds that urban type light industrial growth can best be accommodated within Urban Growth Boundaries at Glen Cove. The zoning of the Glen Cove UGA should support light industry and limited commercial development, discouraging retail uses which do not support light industrial uses.

The additional designation of commercial/industrial property at these two proposed UGAs, beyond that already used for such purpose, will be taken from the 280 acres

identified under the 4.0% growth rate assumption. Designation of the balance will occur either

- ~~///~~ as part of community plans developed for Brinnon, Quilcene or other areas;
- ~~///~~ as part of the Plan's update in 2003 when actual growth rates can be compared to the forecast assumption; or
- ~~///~~ upon review of City of Port Townsend actions to intensify land uses within its jurisdiction

Capital facilities scaled to need and the ability to pay

There have been wide ranging estimates of what it will cost homeowners, business owners, renters and rate payers to provide urban level services to new Urban Growth Areas. Much of the debate has revolved around the definition of "urban service" itself. A definition is not as critical within the existing or expanded Port Townsend UGA where urban services have been provided for many years. It becomes more important in a decision of whether to form a new UGA in the Tri-Area, where more rural services have been provided in the past. Contacts with numerous sources including the Washington Department of Community and Economic Development have failed to provide the County with a clear definition. The County is left to develop its own definition based on its understanding of past Growth Hearings Board decisions, the Countywide Planning Policies, and its adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Sewer service:

The Board finds that a higher level of sewage treatment must be planned for that portion of the Tri-Area designated as a UGA. The numerous building lots already in existence, the location of the Irondale area above a critical aquifer recharge and wellhead protection area and the yet to be determined water protection measures under the salmon listing all require that the potential need for sewage collection and treatment systems be considered in the plan.

There are numerous sewage treatment systems available which, while not meeting the more traditional image of sewer lines, treatment plants, outfalls, etc., do provide a level of service greater than the current septic systems in existence in the Tri-Area. These systems include so-called Septic Tank Effluent Pumping (STEP), dispersed drainfields, community drainfields and others.

The Board finds that conventional sewer systems are not, in fact should not be considered a minimum requirement within the Irondale/Hadlock UGA. Such systems require centralized sewage treatment plants with deep-water outfalls. The State Department of Ecology has clearly stated that deep-water outfalls will no longer be allowed for new utility systems. A new conventional sewer system in an Irondale/Hadlock UGA would fall under this prohibition and make such a conventional system a "non-starter" in every sense of that phrase.

Based on discussions between utility experts, citizens experienced in utility development and consultants to the County, it is the Board's conclusion that a dispersed collection and treatment system, using wetland discharge instead of an outfall, is feasible. It would also meet a reasonable definition of "urban level of service".

The Board understands that other forms of treatment may be available and will look to the Community Planning Group to review these possibilities in the next phase of work. Actual construction may require formation of a utility district or may require a local improvement district under auspices of the Jefferson County Public Utility District which is empowered to perform maintenance services on such systems. The Board cannot ensure that either method will be employed because of the detailed capital facilities planning that will have to be carried out to the satisfaction of both the citizens and any administrative unit (PUD, utility district, etc.). These are matters for which consensus must be developed among the affected parties. However, the Board finds that there is a reasonable probability that a sewer system can be developed during the planning period at an affordable cost to rate payers.

In the case of Glen Cove, the Board finds that the desire by the City of Port Townsend to ultimately serve the industrial area justifies a finding that an urban level of sewer service can be provided to an expanded UGA.

Water service:

The Comprehensive Plan outlines a significant issue with regard to water service, supply, administration and ownership, particularly in the Tri-Area. The Plan notes that the Water Utilities Coordinating Committee has delayed addressing these issues until the adoption of a Comprehensive Plan identifying areas of future growth or infill. Upon adoption of Plan amendments establishing UGA boundaries at Glen Cove and designating a UGA in the Irondale/Port Hadlock Area, the water issue must be addressed immediately to address a lingering concern by residents, businesses and agencies. Such a statement is doubly true in mid-2001 because the City of Port Townsend and the PUD are in the process of 'trading' water systems, giving the City of Port Townsend ownership of the water system that serves Glen Cove and the PUD control of the water provider for the Tri-Area.

Roads:

The main traffic arteries serving the study area are State Highways. SR 19 and SR 20 are highways of statewide significance and are not subject to concurrency requirements. SR 116 would be subject to that requirement. Should the acceptable or permitted level of service on that road be exceeded, the County could face having to impose restrictions on development until improvements were made. The traffic study prepared for the SEIS shows that all three highways would face significant capacity problems as early as 2003 if a UGA was formed.

The County's Comprehensive Plan notes that a concurrency management system is being developed. Due to the lack of clear direction on concurrency, there are various means being studied to deal with the requirement.

It is clear from the Traffic Study that a UGA covering the entire Tri-Area would severely affect the road system and would most likely trigger a concurrency issue within a few years. A smaller UGA would allow development more in line with the existing development trends that were studied during the 1998 Plan effort. It would also result in a reduction of the LOS standard from "C" to "D" which in turn would reduce the likelihood of a concurrency problem. Individual project reviews would allow the County to monitor level of service changes and to require mitigation or road improvements from development sponsors.

The Tri-Area as a community

Residents of the Tri-Area have stated varying opinions on whether they wish to develop as an urban or more of a rural community. They seem united, however, in the goal of developing as a *community*. The area from Chimacum to Hadlock to Irondale possesses a common history and many common interests. The County Plan should acknowledge this.

For reasons discussed before, the Board is unable to draw a UGA boundary around the entire Tri-Area. It will agree to identify a limited UGA at Hadlock and Irondale based on findings that designating this amount of urban land is justifiable and serviceable. The County will also consider an urban reserve area extending to Chimacum to reflect future intentions to consider UGA expansions when and if warranted. Standards will be drafted allowing clustering of development using rural services. Additional density would be permitted in the future when UGA boundaries are drawn and when urban services are provided.

The County will work with residents of the Tri-Area to identify strategies for building a cohesive community. The BOCC will work with citizens to complete a Sub-Area Plan for the Irondale Port Hadlock UGA that will address issues and goals in this area. The Board recognizes that water service is a major concern to residents and will cooperate in the development of studies and interlocal agreements to ensure an adequate supply in the future.

Support of existing business.

The BOCC acknowledges and values the presence of several businesses adjacent to the logical boundaries at Glen Cove and along SR 19/20. The Board finds that the vitality of these businesses depends heavily on a predictable future. When the logical boundaries were created based on ESB 6094 standards (which amended, among other statutes, RCW 36.70A.070), they were drawn conservatively pending the outcome of the Special Study.

The Board is now comfortable that designation of an Urban Growth Boundary to include existing businesses in Glen Cove is consistent with the GMA and the Comprehensive

Plan. It will provide a secure environment for business growth and will help to meet the commercial and industrial land supply needs outlined in the Special Study. It also allows UGA designation in line with the goals and policies of the City of Port Townsend. Designation of a UGA does not answer the question of when or if these areas might be annexed to the City of Port Townsend. Timing will depend in large measure on agreement between the City and County on several issues regarding the cost of services, sharing of tax revenues, transition of land development rules, etc. Both the City and County have agreed to discuss these issues in a mutually respectful manner.

Creating a limited UGA at Irondale and Port Hadlock will allow for intensification of residential and commercial uses helping to build a community center.

Support for the City of Port Townsend and South County

The Board of County Commissioners has been engaged in planning discussions with the City of Port Townsend for several years. The Joint Growth Management Committee has provided and will provide a worthwhile vehicle for communicating the community development objectives of each jurisdiction. There are, and will always be, differences of opinion on specific issues, but maintaining an open dialog between the City, the County and the community provides the best hope of a truly comprehensive planning process.

The Board also recognizes that its efforts over the past years have been directed toward planning issues in North County. This does not mean that it has lost sight of the concerns of citizens in the County's southern region. It is mindful of economic development issues at Brinnon and Quilcene as well as the desire by citizens to update community plans.

In adopting the Plan amendments contained in this Decision Document, the Board assumes that both the City of Port Townsend and South County will find support for its planning efforts and certainly no conflicts with them. The County intends to continue working cooperatively with both on issues of mutual concern. The elected County Commissioners await the results of the Brinnon Sub-Area Planning Group, due to be received by the BoCC before the end of the year 2001.

[END]

For more information please contact:

Randy Kline, Project Planner
Jefferson County Department of Community Development
621 Sheridan Street
Port Townsend, WA 98368
Phone (360) 379-4464
Fax (360) 379-4473
Email rkline@co.jefferson.wa.us

Or visit the Jefferson County website at www.co.jefferson.wa.us